

Peace News

The International Pacifist Weekly

No. 1,111 October 11, 1957 4d. US Air Express Edition 10 cents

Sidelights on the H-bomb debate

By GENE SHARP

ON Thursday of last week I listened to the Labour Party conference debate on the hydrogen bomb and disarmament at Brighton. It was exciting and at times electrifying. And at times depressing.

Reports of the debate have already been widely publicised. Most people know the final vote was against Britain unilaterally renouncing the hydrogen bomb.

But before Mr. Bevan spoke, it was clear that there was very considerable sentiment in favour of strong unilateral action on this issue by the next Labour Government.

There were several resolutions on the floor during the general debate, but the main attention was centred on the H-bomb.

There were two resolutions on some form of unilateral action on the H-bomb. One urged "the Parliamentary Labour Party to Press the Government to give a moral lead to the world by announcing that no further nuclear bomb tests will be undertaken by this country."

In his speech for the Executive Committee Mr. Bevan said their recommendation was to accept this resolution, interpreting it as meaning not "no further nuclear bomb tests" but "suspension" and how long a suspension, he said, is a practical question, "not one of principle."

Question to Bevan

During the debate Mr. Bevan said: "The suspension of the tests means suspension of production." But the next day I asked him:

"Is it a correct interpretation of your speech yesterday that the Executive Committee is agreed that the suspension of the tests also means the simultaneous suspension of the manufacture of nuclear weapons?"

Mr. Bevan replied: "No, but it might. We have faced the fact that the suspension of the tests might have the practical consequence of suspension of development."

The core of the debate centred on the resolution moved by Lambeth, Norwood Constituency Labour Party, and seconded by Leek CLP.

This resolution said that because in a major nuclear war there would be "neither victor nor vanquished," and the tests themselves are dangerous, the Conference:

- (1) Oppose "further testing or manufacture of nuclear weapons by all countries,"
- (2) Call for a "national campaign using all means including mass demonstrations" against nuclear weapons tests,
- (3) Pledge "that the next Labour Government will unilaterally refuse to test, manufacture or use nuclear weapons," and appeal to peoples of other countries to follow this lead, and
- (4) Call for an examination of how best to mobilise "the full force of the international working class movement . . . to stop any further tests."

It was against this resolution that Mr. Bevan levelled his attack: "This resolution, I admit, is the most important of all." The Chairman also described this as "the most

India's elder statesman challenges Nye

WHAT IS STATESMANSHIP MR. BEVAN?

By C. Rajagopalachari

Governor-General of India 1948-1950, Prime Minister of Madras 1937-1939.

AT the recent Labour Party Annual Conference a group advocated unilateral action renouncing nuclear weapons. This was characterised by Mr. Aneurin Bevan as an "emotional spasm." It was not, he said, statesmanship.

What is statesmanship? It is not just bargaining and bargaining and no end to it.

When the process of bargaining over a question of whether humankind may live or not results after an interminable length of time in no conclusion, and the world's health and civilisation's hope demand that something should be done, unilateral action is the only form of statesmanship available to those who wish to serve their

nation and the world, and not just carry on as politicians.

Higher physics is devoted to research into inter-spatial transmission of forces. So must higher statesmanship deal with inter-human psychic forces acting across space. There are natural laws that govern the influence of one man's activity over another, and of one nation's over another, even though there is no contractual or treaty obligation, just as the movement of electricity and heat is not restricted to direct conduction.

UNILATERAL ACTION

Buddha, Socrates, Christ and Gandhi taught the law of unilateral right action, as against the way of bargaining. Are their teachings only to be idol-worshipped in books?

Why should mankind stop with bargaining statesmanship and not go beyond?

The need has arisen for a courageous application of these teachings regarding the power of unilateral action. The world is threatened with unmeasured calamity unless we meet the situation with something higher and more effective than futile bargaining.

The atomic scientists of West Germany have reaffirmed their unwillingness to take part in any way in the production, testing or operation of atomic weapons. The signatories of the Göttingen declaration of April last met at the annual session of German physical societies on October 2 at Heidelberg and declared:

"We state today that all of us stand by our convictions voiced on April 12 without any qualification."

These German scientists in their manifesto pointed out to the politicians that a small country like West Germany could best protect itself and serve world peace by renouncing the possession of atomic weapons.

FAITH IN THE PRINCIPLE OF UNILATERAL ACTION INFORMS THE WHOLE ATTITUDE OF THESE EMINENT SCIENTISTS.

Mixed schools for Central Africa?

From BASIL DELAINE

THE controversial Governor of Northern Rhodesia, Sir Arthur Benson, has shocked and angered certain members of the Legislative Council with a speech made to European pupils and parents of Gilbert Rennie School in the Territory's capital, Lusaka.

Said the bold Sir Arthur:

"In another ten years the average African scholar will be on the same level as the European scholar of the same age. The fact is that you have to live cheek by jowl with them.

"Some people think it will be a long

□ ON PAGE SEVEN



BEVAN'S BRIGHTON BATHOS

★ ON BACK PAGE

Healing fear, hatred, prejudice after THE LEVITTOWN RIOTS

By **Ralph Blackwood M.A.**

US Race Relations Correspondent

MR. WILLIAM A. MYERS, Jr., a 34-year-old Negro, lived in Bloomsdale Gardens, Pennsylvania, until recently. Bloomsdale is an integrated community. He and his wife had Negro and White friends, and led an active community life.

However, the Myers family, now with five children, was growing too large for their home, so Mr. Myers, an educated man earning about \$5,000 (about £1,785) a year, started looking for a larger and better home.

Housing is a problem for anyone here in the U.S.A., but for Negroes it is far greater. In most American cities Negroes live in areas separate from the whites. In some places, as in Harlem, Negroes crowd into ghettos. It is extremely difficult for them to rent or buy houses outside the area. From time to time, however, Negroes break through the invisible wall.

Then the white residents usually show strong resistance. There are protest meetings, street demonstrations, and sometimes rocks are thrown through windows, furniture is tossed into the street and destroyed, or a bomb demolishes the home.

Mr. Myers' new house was in all-white Levittown, Pennsylvania—adjacent to Bloomsdale.

Trouble started almost immediately.

Crowds gathered around the house, jeering and calling names. Someone threw a rock through Myers' large front window. For six days crowds of up to 300 gathered.

Some whites formed a "Levittown Betterment Committee" to "seek every legal and peaceful means of forcing Myers to move." They didn't want Negro neighbours.

"Founded by Quakers"

However, when more rocks were thrown through Myers' windows, the chairman of the Committee said: "It makes me sick. I'm about to quit."

After disturbances on three successive nights, the Pennsylvania Governor sent State police to guard the home.

"I'm ashamed that this occurred in Pennsylvania," he said. "Any family has the right to live where they can obtain the right of legal possession—on any street, road or highway in this commonwealth."

"Pennsylvania was founded by Quakers as a haven to all oppressed peoples."

But the Levittown Betterment Committee planned a mass meeting to expel the Myers family from the community.

As he swept broken glass from his shattered windows, Mr. Myers said: "We will be good neighbours, and I hope that those around us will be the same."

"I am here to stay."

Teen-agers outnumbered adults in the mob. The Township Police Chief asked for a teen-age curfew. Later, the police barred the area to all except residents, and prohibited gatherings of over three persons.

"Declaration of Conscience"

Suddenly Levittown became quiet again. Police stationed along the road and at the entrances to the area told strollers and motorists to keep moving.

About 50 protests against the Myers were made to the Bristol Township Commission.

But quiet and less violent forces were at work healing the fear, hate and prejudice. Hundreds of Levittowners signed

a "Declaration of Conscience" which stood for law and order and deplored all acts of violence against the Myers family.

The Declaration expressed faith that Levittown would "continue to be a good place to live for all its citizens."

Twenty-five neighbours invited the Myers to their homes for dinner. Next-door-neighbours helped the new family serve dinner to members of the Society of Friends (Quakers) from William Penn Centre. Another white couple stayed overnight with the family.

When one Levittowner asked the Board of Commissioners to approve an economic boycott against the Myers, other neighbours responded by sending the family baskets of food.

Hundreds of people from all over the country sent letters to the Myers. Most were friendly and encouraging.

Negroes as neighbours

Since August 19 all has been quiet and orderly.

If we could understand the Levittown incident, we would understand America.

Northern liberals often rant against segregation and prejudice in the South. But Levittown is in the North, and this is far from being the first incident.

But there were clear differences between this and similar episodes in the South. The New York Times said: "The major difference between Pennsylvania and Georgia is that the law and the public authorities in the former State are on the side of decency and equality."

Although the liberals have been silenced in the South, they have not been in Pennsylvania.

A survey by the National Opinion Research Centre at the University of Chicago shows that although the South is more opposed to school integration than the North, Southerners are less opposed to living next to Negroes than are Northerners!!

The Northerners most opposed to living next door to Negroes were to be found in the upper middle class.

The resistance to having Negroes as neighbours is caused, I believe, by fear of economic loss.

Negroes, long on the bottom of the economic ladder, have had to live in overcrowded slums because of racial barriers and very low salaries. Naturally, when they move, they often take the slum along.

Real estate agents

Real estate agents have learned how to get rich playing on the fears of the white people.

They sell one home in an all-white area to a Negro. They then tell the whites that Negroes are moving in, that more will follow, and the neighbourhood will become a slum and their property will depreciate.

The whites get frightened. Everyone tries to sell out, quick. Property values drop rapidly.

Other real estate agents, working hand in hand with the ones who arranged for the first Negro family to move into the community, come and make ridiculously low offers. Panicked, the whites sell and move further out—where they may again face a similar situation a few years later.

The real estate agents make a big profit. They buy cheaply from frightened whites and sell exorbitantly to Negroes in desperate need of better housing.

Ironically, these unprincipled tactics have helped integrate housing in some cities. Some white people simply refuse to move. Some tire of trying to keep a few jumps ahead of expanding Negro areas.

Thanks to these—and the real estate agents—the result is integrated housing.

No freedom for Singapore

NEW VARIATION ON
"DIVIDE AND RULE"

By **Reginald Reynolds**



Reginald Reynolds

IN the sticky heat of Singapore, where there are no seasons (as we know them in the temperate zone) the Legislative Assembly was deliberating.

The Speaker, I noticed as I entered the gallery, wore the full bottomed wig and robes of his Westminster model. He must have been extremely uncomfortable; and it did not surprise me when the Assembly suddenly adjourned at 4 p.m.

The Speaker, I hope, made for the nearest shower bath to seek relief from the burdens of Empire. Lee Kuan Yew, the leader of the Peoples' Action Party, had even more urgent business requiring his attention.

"PAP" is the strongest party in Singapore. A Socialist party, with a mass backing, it has, however, only three members in the Assembly.

The reason may be sought in the constitution, which is typical of British colonialism.

With a heavy weightage of nominated members, including the key members of the Cabinet, the Government has effectively blocked the possibility of any real democracy within the existing constitution, whilst making the usual parade of concessions to popular demands. The Peoples' Action Party put up only four candidates, of whom three were elected in the last elections. It was a sufficient force to use the Assembly as a platform for the democratic opinion which the Constitution was designed to frustrate, whilst it avoided the temptations and compromises which might have been the result of a larger representation. PAP is pledged not to work the present constitution.

Separated

But the internal problems of PAP are typical of the complicated politics of Malaya. We have, of course, separated Singapore from the Malayan Federation. Singapore remains a colony while the rest of the country celebrated its independence on August 31. As a comment on the claim that freedom is granted to colonial peoples when they are "ready" for it, the whole business is an eye-opener. By our own standards Singapore and its people, more urban, more educated than the neighbouring states across the Causeway, might be assumed to have the better claim. If anybody has the right to say when somebody else is "fit" for self-government, I should have expected the British, by British standards of "fitness," to have agreed with this. And so they would, no doubt, if Singapore had not been of such great military importance.

So they cut the country in two in a way which can only be understood if we try to imagine that the whole of Britain is independent except for London, which is ruled by the Chinese. Economically and politically the idea was and is obviously disastrous; but the Brass Hats demanded that it should be so. They had their way and Malaya will pay the price. By Malaya I include Singapore. Only by a political fiction can they be separated.

Internal problem

This is the setting for the internal problems of the PAP. No "left" party, operating so near to the power house of Asian Communism, is safe from Communist infiltration; especially in a place like Singapore, with a predominantly Chinese population, plenty of poverty, and so many living links with the New China.

The more outrageous the behaviour of Whitehall and its agents in South-East Asia, the more grist to the Communist mill. A

man like Lee Kuan Yew knows that the answer to British colonialism is not to become a satellite of Red China. He does not want Communist ruthlessness in place of our own peculiar mixture of ruthlessness, compromise and duplicity. So there he is, fighting the Communist or near-Communist agents who have infiltrated into his own party, when the Government detains a number of them without trial. He would be hardly human if one side of him did not welcome their removal. But the honest democrat in him objects to this arbitrary way of dealing with opponents—even though they are his own opponents, as well as being opponents of the Government.

Even as a politician he can see that he must now fight for their rights or lose all claim to represent the masses against the Government.

British policy

This is tough on Lee. If he won't fight for his opponents he will betray his own principles and the long-term interests of his party. If he does fight for them he makes heroes of them.

Was the Government stupid or diabolically clever?

One way or the other they have put the only effective opposition in the awkward position of having to lean—to all appearances—either towards Communism or towards British imperialism.

And nothing suits British policy better—if you identify British policy with British militarism and the investment it claims to protect. If a colonial leader, faced by such a dilemma, comes down (or even appears to do so) on the side of Whitehall, we strengthen our position. If he takes the opposite course, he can the more easily be labelled a "Red" and discredited in the eyes of the Western World and even of many fellow-countrymen.

It is a new variation of "Divide and Rule."

At least, it will work like that for a time. But if the British force such a choice on any people in Asia it may not work out as they hoped. If they succeed in discrediting men like Lee Kuan Yew they are likely to find that the real and ultimate victory will go to the Communists.

Reginald Reynolds writes again next week.



writes every week

GET YOUR COPY NOW—

NAME

ADDRESS

222 STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

Subs: 6 months 16s. 12 months £1 12s.



BOOK TOKENS

Any book in print speedily supplied or ask for our list

available by post, and exchanged by HOUSMANS BOOKSHOP 3 BLACKSTOCK ROAD, LONDON N.4

Wants to end Copperbelt violence

From BASIL DELAINE

MR. HARRY NKUMBULA, President of the Northern Rhodesian Congress, who recently requested permission to broadcast a warning to Congress supporters to call off the month-old boycott of municipal beer-halls on the Copperbelt and to stop violence, has received a curt "No" to his request. But he has been told that if he prepares a statement and submits it to the Northern Rhodesian broadcasting authorities it will be considered on its merits for possible inclusion in a broadcast. Mr. Nkumbula said that his Congress branch leaders on the Copperbelt were ignoring head office appeals to end the disorder.



Young German pacifists attend a lecture at the "Mill of Peace," the International Fellowship of Reconciliation centre in Versailles, France, run by Andre and Magda Trocme.

WAYS AND MEANS

IT has never been the way of the Peace Pledge Union to have any kind of means test for pacifism by making a subscription a condition of membership, but we do, of course, rely on the conscience of our members to prompt them not only to sign the pledge but to provide the money required for maintaining and extending the pacifist witness.

We are greatly helped by those who have become voluntary annual subscribers and send us at PPU Headquarters a yearly total of £2,000. All on that list who have not yet sent in their annual subscription will receive a further reminder before the end of the year, but if you are one, you could save us at least 2d. by making a reminder needless.

Minnie Pallister wrote our annual appeal which went to all PPU members on the live file who are not voluntary annual subscribers. That appeal has so far produced about £350 and an urgent reminder has recently been sent to those who have not yet responded. We hope that it will bring in a further £300.

To the PPU Headquarters Fund we look for an additional £1,150, of which to date we have received £677. Although a few PPU Groups and members who help through subscriptions or the annual appeal also send gifts to Headquarters Fund, we rely mainly on readers of Peace News who do not give financial help to the PPU in any other way.

Does that mean you? If so, I hope you will find some way to help the PPU Headquarters Fund reach its aim for the year during the next three months within which we still mean to raise £473. With the help of every reader who has not yet sent us any contribution this year that will be easy. Without your help it might be impossible—although that word we have never had to use in connection with the PPU Headquarters Fund. In any case, you are going to help in some way by some means, aren't you?

STUART MORRIS, General Secretary.

Donations to the Peace Pledge Union, which are used for the work of the PPU, should be sent marked "Headquarters Fund," to the PPU Treasurer at Dick Sheppard House, Endsleigh St., London, W.C.1.

NEWS FROM GERMANY

War Resisters carry their torches through Bremen

PACIFISTS EXPECT STRONGER OPPOSITION FROM NEW GOVERNMENT

By Hilda von Klenze

RAIN spat angrily into the flames and the wind blew them into fantastic shapes as the torchlight procession formed up in the shadow of the cathedral. The front ranks moved away, the slogans on their posters, "Say No to War" and "End Conscription," brightly lit up.

The golden ribbon of almost one thousand marchers with blazing torches began

circle out of the way of the flying sparks and the feathery flames of the bonfire which grew and grew as torch after torch was added to it.

A voice rang out of the dark telling the marchers to go forward carrying the torch of peace and not to falter till they had achieved their goal. Then the rain came down again, the spectators turned away from the dying fire, and the first day of the Annual General Meeting of the German Section of the War Resisters' International was over.

It had begun at 2 p.m. on September 28, when about 215 members and delegates assembled in the Trade Hall at Bremen to receive reports of the year's activities from groups and areas.

HELP DURING SUEZ CRISIS

I was glad to convey to the gathering a message from the Chairman of the WRI, Harold Bing, and greetings from the British Peace Pledge Union, and to express once more their gratitude for the generous donation from the German Section at the time of the Suez crisis.

Later in the afternoon—I almost wrote "after tea," but the Germans do not believe in such frivolous interruptions of serious business—some young members of the Hamburg Group presented a "cabaret" of political and social satire, which was well received as an experiment in new methods of propaganda.

In the evening Dr. Wenzel, Chairman of the German Section, spoke at a public meeting numbering about 500 on "The Power of Non-Violence," which preceded the torchlight procession.

Looking at the assembly on the following morning, I was struck by the fact that young members in their thirties and below far outnumbered the older generation and that there were comparatively few women.

It was obvious that conscription is the main issue in the German movement at present.

The recent elections also were very much in mind, partly because several groups were able to report a noticeable increase of their membership since the results were declared, and partly because they anticipated that the Government would adopt more restrictive measures against organisations opposed to rearmament and conscription.

"NOW MORE THAN EVER"

The cold war and the introduction of conscription have confronted the German Section with problems which were not foreseen at the time of its revival in 1947. It is therefore still in a formative stage, and this year's AGM was largely concerned with organisational adjustments in response to the changing situation.

The debates were lively, often heated, but there could be no doubt about the intense eagerness of the young delegates to overcome their difficulties and to go forward in the spirit of that determined "Now more than ever" with which the re-elected Chairman, Dr. Wenzel, closed the meeting on Sunday night.

A new feature in Peace News

RELIGIOUS FLASHPOINT

Watch this page each week for the **Pacifist Challenge to the Church.**

Many pacifists deliberately "walked-out" of church life during the First and Second World Wars because of the pro-war attitude of the Christian Church. Many other pacifists accept the teachings of Jesus but not the dogma and theology of the Church.

This new Peace News feature will interest them. It will also interest agnostics as well as members of religious denominations.

Correspondence will be invited.

MOVEMENT FOR A PACIFIST CHURCH OF CHRIST

8 Barclay Oval • Woodford Wells • Essex

New army's first conscientious objector

From HELGA STOLLE

CLAUS POMREHN, a 19-year-old mason of Dusseldorf, was one of the first boys to become liable on April 1 to military service in the new German Army.

Unaware of the right of conscientious objection, he entered the army as a Pioneer, though he abominated war and preparation for it.

In June he refused to take the military oath, the duty of every soldier.

Home on leave in July, he met by chance the chairman of the War Resisters' International Group in Essen and learned that even though he was now in the army it was possible to be registered as a conscientious objector.

On July 16 his case was heard. Two witnesses confirmed that Pomrehn had discussed conscription with his fellow workers, always protested against it and all war preparations, and had not known of the right of conscientious objection.

Not a coward

Claus Pomrehn himself explained the reasons for his stand—most of them rational ones.

Asked whether he found military service hard, he replied:

"It is a trifle compared with my regular work as a mason."

Convinced by his answers, by the fact that he had planned to go to Venezuela after finishing his 12-month-service in order to escape any further re-call to the forces, and the information that he was a successful boxer, the Tribunal came to the conclusion that conscription was not being objected to because the man was cowardly or lazy. They registered him as a CO: the first conscript to be so registered after entering the German army.

Returning to his unit near Hamburg,

Claus handed the decision (which would according to law ensure his discharge after 14 days) to his superior officer.

But nothing happened.

Forced to go on with his military service the boy turned to the Hamburg Group of the War Resisters' International, who started a widespread Press and Radio campaign.

Help from Hamburg COs

Some days later Claus was told to hand in his uniform and do only inner-service. Several days then went by without anything further happening, and the young CO sought help from a solicitor with the object of taking action against the Minister of Defence if undischarged within seven days.

To help him, Hamburg conscientious objectors picketed the barracks on the army's "Day-of-the-open-door" and gave away to visitors 5,000 leaflets calling for Pomrehn's discharge.

One day before the ultimatum to the Minister expired Pomrehn was sent home on leave. Two days later he was discharged from the army.

Case of Mr. Cousins

IN our leading article we have paid the compliment to Mr. Bevan's speech in opposition to resolution 24 at the Labour Party Conference of treating it as a serious contribution to the discussion of the question that was being debated. We nevertheless realise that it was nothing of the sort. It was a tricky demagogic performance in which Mr. Bevan used all kinds of scraps of unrelated argument that might serve his purpose.

The power of the contribution was not in the quality of the arguments that were advanced but in the fact that it was Mr. Bevan who was making it.

We must admit that we have no sense of personal disappointment here, for Mr. Bevan's performance seems to us to be completely characteristic. He has done this kind of thing before when it has seemed to him that the occasion called for it, and no doubt we shall see him do it again.

We refer to the matter on this personal level because although we have experienced no surprise at Mr. Bevan's performance we had different expectations with regard to Mr. Cousins; and we still think that there is reason to hope that his part in this business has a quite different quality from that of Mr. Bevan.

Mr. Cousins' Union had recently passed a resolution urging that Britain should dissociate itself from the testing, use and manufacture of nuclear weapons. Mr. Cousins put the view of his Union in a moving speech to the Labour Party Conference and in the course of it remarked that there is "no compromise with evil". Nevertheless, Mr. Cousins asked for a delay in the taking of the vote and when it was taken the vote of his Union was cast against the resolution for which he had spoken.

Party unity

The following is what we believe to have happened. The Transport and General Workers' Union had passed a resolution which had found expression in Motion 24 on the Brighton Agenda, but not all the Executive of the Union were in agreement with it. The Labour Party Executive badly wanted the defeat of the motion and there was doubtless a concentration of pressures on the T. & G. W. delegation.

These delegates had been impressed by the need for Party unity which they regarded as something more important than the question whether Britain should make H-bombs. The speech of Mr. Bevan was the culmination of such pressures and they had urged upon Mr. Cousins that a reconsideration of the matter was necessary. At the lunch-time conference of the delegation the view that had been urged by Mr. Cousins was defeated (Mr. Cousins, it is understood, voting with the minority in a 16 to 1 vote) and Mr. Cousins agreed to abide by the decision of the delegation.

Mr. Cousins was in a considerable dilemma in this business, and although we could wish that he had found a different way of resolving it, we have every sympathy with him in his position, which had nothing in common with the tricky piece of demagoguery that had helped to bring it about.

Labour's 'democracy'

We have more than once pointed out that the decisions of both the TUC and the Labour Party Conference can have little relationship to the declared wishes of the rank and file membership because there is very seldom an opportunity for the Trade Union membership to declare itself on the issues that are to be settled.

Here was one of the few cases in which a Union Conference had declared itself and, as we have seen, its vote was cast against the view for which it had declared.

Framework collapses

THE unhappy French delegation to the UN General Assembly will have to face that body with the mighty, but essentially futile, labours devoted to the formulation and watering down of the "framework-law" for Algeria having been brought to naught.

In this framework-law, after the resounding declaration that "Algeria is an integral part of the French Republic, one and indi-



visible" an endeavour was made to provide something that might be imposed on the peoples of Algeria as an acceptance by the French of "the Algerian personality" and allow the peoples of this land some semblance of control over their own affairs while denying them the right to make their own decisions.

There has been an element of the grotesque about these labours from the beginning, for it has always been evident that responsible representatives of the indigenous Algerians would not accept it as

a basis for negotiation. What has happened in the negotiations to pilot the draft through the Assembly has been the elimination or evasion of the aspects that different sections of the French political Right felt might strengthen subsequent claims for independence.

Thus, the assemblies of the "autonomous" territories into which Algeria was to be divided were at first to be called "Legislative Assemblies". In the text of the law as amended the word "legislative" has been taken out.

Editorial and Publishing office.

3 Blackstock Road
London, N.4

Tel: STAmford Hill 2262

PEACE NEWS

October 11, 1957

Distribution office for U.S.A.

20, S. Twelfth St.,
Philadelphia 7, Pa.

Reg'd as a newspaper. Entered
as second class matter at
Post Office, Philadelphia, Pa.

MR. BEVAN'S POWER POLITICS

WITHOUT THE BOMB, a British Foreign Secretary would go naked into the international conference chamber, said Mr. Bevan in his speech at the Labour Party Conference against a British renunciation of the manufacture and use of the hydrogen bomb.

Alternatively, he suggested, Britain would have relegated itself to diplomatic purdah. Despite a certain incongruity in the choice of similes, the meaning is clear:

MR. BEVAN OBJECTS TO THE RENUNCIATION OF THE H-BOMB BECAUSE WITHOUT IT THE BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND ITS FOREIGN SECRETARY WOULD HAVE NOTHING EFFECTIVE WITH WHICH TO THREATEN.

This point should be made clear, for it is a habit of Labour politicians—carried over from a past when a different sentiment obtained in regard to international relations—to declaim against "power politics." We have little doubt that Mr. Bevan has so declaimed himself.

The whole basis of Mr. Bevan's case at Brighton was the plea that Britain should not be deprived of the modern means necessary if power politics are to be pursued.

MUCH THAT MR. BEVAN URGED by no means followed from his own premises. For instance, the renunciation of the H-bomb by Britain no more involves the "dismantling of the whole fabric of British international relationships" and the "contracting out of all her commitments and undertakings" than the fact that Britain's ally, France, has not equipped herself with the H-bomb means she must contract out.

Similarly there was nothing in the resolution that would have prevented a Labour Government from "telling" the members of the Commonwealth that it was adopting such a course and that certain adjustments would necessarily follow.

Indeed the passage of the resolution by the Conference would have been a considerable advance notice of what was to be expected; and on this point we are not aware that Mr. Bevan made any protest when Mr. Attlee embarked on the policy of the manufacture of A-bombs without any kind of consultation of the members of the Commonwealth—or the British people for that matter.

A great deal of Mr. Bevan's argument, however, was based on the unstated assumption that giving up nuclear weapons is today tantamount to renunciation of all dependence on arms, a view with which we agree.

OF COURSE, A POLICY OF RENUNCIATION OF ARMAMENTS IMPLIES A DIFFERENT SET OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS. OF COURSE, IT IMPLIES A FOREIGN SECRETARY WITHOUT THE POWER TO THREATEN DEATH TO GREAT POPULATIONS OF HELPLESS PEOPLE. AND, OF COURSE, IT IMPLIES A RADICAL CHANGE IN THE WAY IN WHICH BRITAIN WOULD FACE THE WORLD.

SUCH A CHANGE, however, would not be an afterthought, a necessary "by-product" of the resolution. It would have been the implementation of the various policies which Mr. Bevan's friends have been advocating and to which he has often given lip-service.

It could mean that Britain would give an inspiring lead in a new policy of human brotherhood, helping to bring freedom and development to the hitherto submerged peoples of the world. Britain will never be able to do this while its policies are limited and conditioned by participation in the competitive struggle in the development of arms.

The problems involved in the required readjustments and in the development of a new and positive policy of hope are not all easy ones, it may be readily admitted.

These problems have inevitably formed part of the material of Mr. Bevan's discussions with his friends.

IT IS TO BE REGRETTED THAT THE USE HE HAS FINALLY FOUND FOR THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN IN THE DESTRUCTION OF THE POLICY UPON WHICH THEY HAVE BEEN ENGAGED.

The Federal Council, which was to exercise such powers as were left to it by the French Government on the one hand and the territorial assemblies on the other, presented a field for disagreement in the negotiations between the French Parties so the question was eliminated by putting back for 18 months after the election of the territorial assemblies the settlement of the conditions in which the Federal Council should function.

The original draft of the law provided for the yearly appointment of a President of the Federal Council; because it was feared that he might come to be regarded as an independence leader he has been eliminated and his functions given to the French Governor and his French assistants.

Incidentally it is to be noted that in addition to a very generous range of the usual "reserved powers" the control of mines and power is also reserved to the Metropolitan Government.

However, all these labours, which have been undertaken so largely in order to present a plausible front to the General Assembly have been nullified on the eve of the Assembly's discussion of the matter by the fact that the Government of M. Bourges-Manoury has been refused a vote of confidence through a concentration of the right-wing elements who, with the Communists, have cast their votes against it. The French delegation thus has to face the Assembly with the claim that Algeria is an integral part of an indivisible France, coupled with the admission that the Government of indivisible France has no policy for governing it.

Mr. Osborne's view

THE article by Mr. Henry Osborne, MP, which appears on page eight, may seem out of place in Peace News.

We must admit that we decided to publish it primarily because Mr. Osborne is quoting from our report of the speeches at the Trafalgar Square H-bomb rally and made a special appeal for the hospitality of our columns.

Nevertheless, we think the article can be of use to the pacifist case.

We believe Mr. Osborne's arguments to be false on whatever plane they are examined, militarist or pacifist.

On the former, for instance, Mr. Osborne does not feel the necessity to argue his case that "as a nation we should never have made" A- and H-bombs and that we must now renounce them. Presumably he takes the view that there is no need to argue this point in a pacifist journal, for we are bound to agree with him.

He ought to know that for us, however, the renunciation of these things is founded on a moral rejection of the idea that we should use them in any circumstances, and that it cannot therefore depend on support in the calculation that should the occasion arise the US will use them for us.

Although Mr. Osborne urges that Britain should "unconditionally" renounce the manufacture and use of A- and H-weapons, his case is based on what are at best some highly chancy calculations and at the worst a plain lack of realism. It is the latter that we believe to be true.

In regard to his longer term calculations, the idea that the non-nuclear nations should come together and enforce their will upon the two nuclear giant powers is doubly fantastic: in the first place this kind of alignment will not supersede the grouping of interests and ideologies that assemble the nations into blocs at the present time; and in the second place the whole world of non-nuclear powers could not assemble the force that could bring the two nuclear giants to heel.

Cannot Mr. Osborne see that by the time America and Russia have reached the point of joining a Federation of Nations they must have composed their differences, and then, instead of policing each other—which is his euphemistic way of describing the present situation—they will be able to police the world, and we shall have arrived at "World Government."

We hope Mr. Osborne will like it; and sometimes, to be frank, we think he will. For ourselves it is a development that we view with extreme distaste, and we are looking for ways to avoid it. That is one of the reasons why we prefer Sir Stephen King-Hall's approach to our present dilemma.

CRIME

WRI

says th
Report
draws
crime

"In
likely
not a
Sin
meas
age, a
differ
such
note

"M
God
privac
his ch
own
which
not i
utmos
humai
sibility

If we
importa
to war,
does no
a man to
Altho
in war a
a pacifis
as a crim

The C
that war
finds th
sweep o
Bible, th
and the

He is
more r
Church
trary to

If mai
alone, it
that suc
lowed b
Christia
in most
which s
offences
with ma

CLERGY

The C
gests th
services
reconsid
Departm
Church's
the mos
efforts.

The C
vantages
lain at p

"H
than
their
sympa
influe
promc
graces

Such
men of
work an
not beli
died unt
to be a
comes a
the auth

A sin
Chaplain
with the
second
be paid
rank, or
for its
wearing
mainten
of the
imply th
not com
As sc

CRIME & SIN

WRITING in his Diocesan News, the Archbishop of Canterbury says that one value of the Wolfenden Report is the forceful attention it draws to the distinction between a crime and a sin:

"In a civilised society all crimes are likely to be sins also, but most sins are not and ought not to be treated as crimes. Sin is an offence against God. Its measurements do not vary from age to age, as man's laws do. . . . A crime is a different matter, a sin against society of such a kind that the law has to take note of it. . . .

"Man's ultimate responsibility is to God alone. . . . There is a sacred realm of privacy for every man where he makes his choices and decisions, a realm of his own essential rights and liberties into which the law, generally speaking, must not intrude. This is a principle of the utmost importance for the preservation of human freedom, self-respect and responsibility."

If we apply his words to the even more important problem of the Christian attitude to war, it must be remembered that the law does not intrude on the individual right of a man to refuse military service.

Although the pacifist regards participation in war as sin, the law regards the refusal of a pacifist to accept the verdict of a tribunal as a crime.

★

The Christian pacifist has always claimed that war is both a sin and a crime, and he finds the warrant for that in the broad sweep of God's purpose as revealed in the Bible, the teaching and example of Christ, and the witness of the early Church.

He is indeed supported in that view by more recent pronouncements from the Churches, who all declare that war is contrary to the will of God.

If man's ultimate responsibility is to God alone, it would seem reasonable to expect that such pronouncements would be followed by the injunction that therefore no Christian should take part in war. Instead in most cases it is followed by the "but" which suggests that the measurement of offences against God do vary in accordance with man's law or the attitude of the State.

CLERGY IN UNIFORM

The Church of England Newspaper suggests that the reorganisation of the armed services provides a suitable opportunity for reconsidering the Royal Army Chaplains' Department, saying that in some ways the Church's mission to the Forces is among the most anomalous and inconsistent of her efforts.

The CEN points out some of the disadvantages keenly felt by the individual chaplain at present:

"His loyalties are often less ecclesiastical than military. High-ranking officers and their wives, some of whom may not be in sympathy with his work, exercise great influence over his ministry. . . . Their promotion may be determined by social graces rather than by moral leadership."

Such are some of the reasons why fewer men of real calibre are volunteering for work among the Forces, and the CEN does not believe that the position can be remedied until the Chaplains' Department ceases to be a branch of the War Office and becomes a living part of diocesan life under the authority of the Bishops.

★

A similar proposal was put up to the Chaplains' Department some 25 years ago, with the suggestion that chaplains should be seconded by their bishops and should not be paid by the Army, given commissioned rank, or wear military uniform. One reason for its rejection of discipline was that the wearing of uniform was necessary for the maintenance of discipline and the protection of the chaplain, which in itself seems to imply that the right type of chaplains were not coming forward.

As some chaplains have found out by

LAST week's Labour Party Conference at Brighton has been interpreted as a retreat to the right.

That was true of its decision on public ownership. It was true of its decision on nuclear weapons: no party which tolerates the making and testing of the H-bomb can be regarded as progressive and creative. But it was emphatically not true of colonial affairs. In this sphere Labour policy has advanced more radically than in any field.

A year ago the Labour Conference adopted a policy on the most difficult of all colonial issues: the political future of territories where there are white settlers. This will be the acid test of the Party's courage and sincerity when Labour comes to office. Will it stand up to the reactionaries among the privileged European minority in Central Africa and Kenya?

The Labour Party declared at Blackpool a year ago for immediate parity of representation between the African and immigrant races, to be followed by full democracy, with every man and woman enjoying the vote, irrespective of race and colour. The Party insisted that until this democracy is established, no Labour Government will hand over power to the European minority.

These principles are angrily challenged in Central Africa, where the whites demand that they be given sovereign rights. The issue will come to a head just when Labour is likely to come to power in 1960, the date for a revision of Central Africa's constitution.

Cyprus

One of the most important speeches delivered during the Brighton Conference was by James Callaghan, Labour's "shadow" colonial secretary, at the meeting of the Movement for Colonial Freedom. He made it clear that Labour will grant independence to Central Africa only when inter-racial democracy has been accepted by the Europeans.

Last year's policy statement was supplemented this year by the endorsement of two further outlines of policy, the first on the smaller colonial territories, the second on economic aid and development.

They were equally radical. If the next Labour Government applies these policies, it will be responsible for a colonial revolution.

The most immediate effect of the smaller territories' policy will be in Cyprus. Labour is now committed in the clearest terms to self-determination. The people may decide for union with Greece; they may decide for independence, as India and Ghana have decided, within the Commonwealth. In either case Labour will accept their decision.

33 Small territories

More important still is the pledge given by Mrs. Castle, on behalf of the Party Executive, fixing a target date for self-determination. Some dismay was caused recently by the use of the phrase "after a considerable period" by the Labour Front Bench in Parliament.

Now the promise is given that self-determination will be applied during Labour's next term of office: that is a maximum of five years. During the intervening period Cyprus will have internal self-government. I think this proposal will be acceptable to Archbishop Makarios and the majority of the Cypriot people.

But Cyprus is not alone. It will surprise many people to learn that Britain adminis-

experience, it is not possible to preach what they believe to be the full Christian Gospel without incurring the disapproval of the military authorities.

There is even a deeper challenge in the problem than whether chaplains should wear uniform. It is the challenge to each Christian as to whether he or she should be in uniform.

ters no fewer than 33 small territories scattered widely over the world. They include islands in the Pacific, like Fiji, Tonga and the New Hebrides; islands in the Indian Ocean like Mauritius, the Maldives and the Seychelles; Singapore, Sarawak, North Borneo, Hong Kong off the coast of Asia; British Guiana and British Honduras on the American mainland; Sierra Leone, Gambia, Zanzibar, Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland in Africa. Distant London is now responsible for the government of all these outposts and their peoples.

Labour's new policy accepts without qualification their right to democratic institutions and self-determination. If any territory is too small for sovereign independence, the people may decide to federate with other States or to integrate with one of them. The choice is to be theirs.

This principle goes very far. Gambia and Sierra Leone may decide to become

By Fenner Brockway, MP

Chairman, Movement for Colonial Freedom

part of a West African Federation. Mauritius might conceivably decide to integrate with India. British Honduras might opt for integration with Guatemala. Labour hopes that the choice would be within the Commonwealth; but there is no limitation to the self-determination promised.

One wonders how far the implications of this document were understood by the Conference or even by its authors. In a sentence it means the recognition of the right of colonial peoples to tear up the arbitrary and artificial frontiers of the old imperialisms. When this principle is accepted by the other European powers which have colonial possessions, we shall begin to see the maps of much of Africa and Asia, indeed of the world, re-drawn.

Defence expenditure

The statement of economic policy gives the pledge that during the five years following the return of a Labour Government an average of £160,000,000 a year will be contributed towards underdeveloped countries, including the colonies. Contrast this with the £20,000,000 a year now voted by Parliament for this purpose. A splendid advance. But where is the money to come from?

This was not made clear at the Conference.

It seems to me that the only practical source will be a cut in Defence expenditure, but Labour's policy in this regard

has not yet been defined. If Labour persists with nuclear weapons, the military personnel may be smaller but the cost will not necessarily be less. A clarification of Labour's policy on Defence, now that H-bombs are, alas, still to be made, is urgent.

The policy statement outlines how the £160,000,000 will be distributed. The present Colonial Development Fund, not now available to territories which have gained independence, will be transformed into a Commonwealth Development Fund. This would mean that it would be available to India and Ghana and to Nigeria, when, in a few years, it becomes independent.

The second new instrument for economic aid will be SUNFED, the world fund for underdeveloped countries awaiting ratification by the United Nations.

So far it has been held up by America and Britain, on the excuse that they cannot afford contributions because of the demands of Defence!

The Labour statement recognises that that, and it is difficult to believe that America could then have the face to hold out. The World War on Want will begin.

The Labour Statement recognises that private investment must continue on a large scale in colonial territories, but insists on conditions, such as no racial discrimination, training of indigenous workers in skilled jobs and management, trade union recognition. But the proposal which I have made for an International Charter for Investment has not yet been accepted.

Fantastic figures

Colonial and underdeveloped countries are now competing for capital, offering bribes in the form of no taxation and import and export privileges. Nevertheless, those without mineral resources, which often need economic aid most, cannot promise advantages comparable with the high returns which, for example, the copper of Northern Rhodesia affords. The 1956 Company Reports for the copperbelt have recently been published. Look at these fantastic dividend figures:

Roan Antelope Copper Mines:	100%
Mufulira Copper Mines:	125%
Rhokana Corporation:	350%

The International Labour Organisation lays down minimum conditions for workers through international conventions.

We need an international convention to lay down maximum profits and to equalise investment conditions in the different colonial and underdeveloped countries. Financiers should not be allowed to exploit human needs.

This new idea will grow. Meanwhile, we have Labour's plan, an inspiring advance on anything proposed by Britain before. We must win for it the support of British public opinion.

Copyright in India and Africa reserved to author.

Peace messages from Albert Schweitzer, Donald Soper, Martin Niemöller, George Fox, William Blake, and others in

PEACE NEWS

Christmas Cards for 1957

Once more PEACE NEWS offers a distinctive and lovely range of Endsleigh Christmas Cards, expressing the Christmas peace message in design and quotation. Priced from 3d. to 7d. each, the selection includes Nativity, festive, international, inter-racial, photographic, children's . . . all sorts of attractive ideas, as well as many reasonably priced Christmas gifts and stationery requirements. You will particularly like the FRIENDSHIP CALENDAR for 1958 with its telling photographs and quotations (4s. 9d., post free).

Every card and gift sold makes a contribution to the week-by-week peace witness of PEACE NEWS. £2,000 must be raised, yet you can help other causes too through the discounts allowed on bulk and bazaar orders. PLEASE SEND NOW FOR A SAMPLE SELECTION.

COMPLETE SET

11s.

31 assorted cards and envelopes

Full list of Christmas Cards

and Gifts in each packet,

or send s.a.e.

TRIAL PACKET

2s. 9d.

8 assorted cards and envelopes

ENDSLEIGH CARDS (Peace News Ltd.) 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4

UNEF and non-violence

THE main purpose of my article, which you so generously appraised in your leader of September 20, was to pinpoint what I personally believe to be one of the most encouraging and gratifying vindications of pacifist principles on a world level since the UN was established.

Naturally, I find myself in agreement with practically all you urge concerning ending the power struggle, taking risks in disarmament, and giving economic aid to needy countries. But, having sat through those momentous sessions in New York, almost hourly, from which UNEF emerged, it seemed to me that our movement was missing a priceless opportunity by not capitalising on the fact that the UN had dropped into our laps a concrete and positive example (not perfect or complete, but full of future possibilities) of all we have been preaching for many years.

That UNEF has come to stay need not be argued any more. The practical issue is: Is UNEF to be developed (as you seem to fear) into an "international army," or can it be moulded, as many of my UN friends want it to be, into a basically civilian police force—which Stuart Morris correctly describes in his recent pamphlet—to carry out (as national police forces do) emergency tasks, like the Palestine one, of keeping people from fighting each other whenever called upon in any part of the world to do so under the jurisdiction of the UN?

It is all very well to say: "The operations of the UN are . . . dictated by the facts of military power." That is only half true. The operations of the UN are also amenable to many other forces in the world—as the Suez dispute clearly showed—and the moral authority of "We, the Peoples" is one of the strongest of these. If we deny this, we deny the very foundations of our pacifist faith.

Similarly, "readiness to give economic aid to those who need it" is only half the story. We must insist that that aid is channelled through the UN (which we are not doing), so that, in economic affairs also, we can develop international techniques which—like UNEF—are impartial, non-discriminatory, and essentially non-violent.

Pacifists have a great deal to teach the UN. But my experience has been that the UN has also a great deal to teach pacifists. By pointing mainly to the patent defects of the UN, in terms of the power struggle, which everybody can see for themselves, we are neglecting our primary duty, as world citizens, of developing the latent possibilities of the UN as essentially an instrument of non-violent mutual adjustment between nations and as an accepted meeting-place of minds, who are coming increasingly to recognise that military power can never solve their problems.—JAMES AVERY JOYCE, 3 King's Bench Walk, London.

Books for Rhodesia

A CONSIDERABLE number of books have been contributed by readers of Peace News and others in response to Mrs. Coleman's appeal on behalf of African students, and quite a number of parcels have already been dispatched. The cost of this postage has unfortunately by no means been covered by the one and only cheque for the purpose so far received.

Many of the books sent in have been well worth posting and have been warmly welcomed in Rhodesia, and will be enthusiastically read or diligently studied by African students. But that is not true of all the books received here. Some imagination is required. Why should anyone expect a Rhodesian student to be thrilled by a book on, say, "Frog Life in English Ponds"? Generally speaking, text-books produced in the early years of the century are of little value to students in this country, and there is really no reason to suppose that they will be of much more value in Rhodesia. Racial discrimination can take subtle forms!—LEONARD TOMKINSON, 144, Muswell Hill Road, London, N.10.

Petition to Archbishop

SINCE our previous report to your paper the number of signatures to our personally organised Petition to the Archbishop of Canterbury has almost doubled. To date, over 13,000 men and women

have petitioned His Grace to denounce H-bomb and all kindred weapon tests and to demand that Britain, as a Christian country, shall carry out no further such tests.

As more signatures are received they will be forwarded to the Archbishop and this Christian protest thereby continued.—AILEEN HALLSWORTH, HELENA G. SHERLOCK, 9, Alan Road, Withington, Manchester, 20.

Third Japanese Conference

YOUR Editorial on "The Third Japanese Conference" (Peace News, Sept. 6, 1957) is sub-headed "Discussion that leads nowhere." You describe the conference as futile because "the delegates come together holding no views in common other than the now universal desire not to be involved in war. . . . We hope that this will be the last of these conferences."

Let me state three points:

1. Any declaration which can get news space opposing nuclear tests, favouring disarmament and denouncing war is, on its face, one more pro-peace item.

2. To get 3,981 delegates from Japan or any other country to attend and sit through a peace conference is noteworthy. Have you done anything approaching that in Britain? We certainly have not here in the United States.

3. To have these delegates discuss and adopt resolutions as vigorous and as affirmative as those quoted in your Tokyo story and editorial is no mean achievement.

I say three cheers for Japanese leadership in the struggle for peace. May the rest of us do at least half as well.—SCOTT NEARING, Social Science Institute, Harborside, Maine.

This is one of a number of letters we have received on the same subject. We do not feel the need to comment at length, for this letter, like the others, does not discuss the considerations we urged but merely indicates disapproval that they should be expressed. Even a correspondent we respect as much as Mr. Scott Nearing cannot convince us by his mere assertion that there is any great value for peace in a body of people coming together to declare that "we demand universal disarmament with controls accepted by the countries concerned. If agreement on universal, general disarmament is not yet possible, we demand a partial disarmament agreement."—Ed.

Troops for Little Rock

WITH all concern for President Eisenhower's dilemma, I think his armed mission to Arkansas was highly distressing and unfortunate, even if, for the non-pacifist, it proved that the sword is mightier than the pen.

Surely it would have been a lovelier and a stronger thing if the President himself had gone to the school and escorted the coloured children to their classes! But this military move, of course, must recall somewhat the terrible days of General Sherman's march to the sea in 1864, in which some states of the South were laid to waste. The physical and psychological results were disastrous.

These are some of Sherman's own words. "I can make this march and make Georgia howl. . . . I sincerely believe the whole United States would rejoice to have my army turned loose on South Carolina to devastate that state in the manner we have done in Georgia. . . . the whole army is burning with insatiable desire to wreak vengeance upon South Carolina."

I have no sympathy with Governor Faubus and the disgraceful orders to his state militia, but I do understand the Southerners fear in their relationships with the Negroes. I have, in England, a Negro cousin whom I do not know, but whose existence, however much one may sentimentalise about the Negro in theory, plays havoc with the self-esteem of my family. I should like to meet him, but, alas, "it just is not done." Any other person's Negro, yes, but not my own Negro! The only virtue of this situation is, I suppose, that with such an unrest in my own bloodstream I cannot wholly and superficially condemn the segregationist.—ROY WOLSTENHOLME, 19 Long Hey, Hale, Cheshire.

Letters to the Editor

Christian pacifism

THE Rev. Foley has hardly dealt fairly with my letters on the above subject, in both of which I asserted that the open militarisation of the Christian Church started in the reign of Constantine. In his replies he himself admits this but in a manner that suggests that I have denied it. The historical incident I quoted of the enthusiastic fourth century bishops offering to accompany the Emperor to the field of battle in his war against Sapor the Pagan, which is by no means my personal *ipse dixit* and can be verified from the unbiased biography of "Constantine the Great," by John B. Firth (G. P. Putnam's Sons), surely suggests that their conscientious objection to war, *qua* war, was not very deep and that their previous objection to military service for Christians lay more in the fact that this would entail swearing allegiance to the enemy of their faith than in compassionate love that could not bear to take the life of the pagan fellow-man.

This is not to imply for one moment that there were not many faithful pacifists in the Church, and the Fathers quoted by the Rev. Foley and Dr. Cadoux were clearly of this variety. But Erasmus in the fifth century was bitterly complaining: "How come the bishop's staff and sword to agree? . . . that the theologians preach war with the self-same lips with which they proclaim Jesus Christ, the Peacemaker? . . . Oh, you cruel, shameless lips, how dare you call Him your Father whilst you rob your brother of life?" which he would hardly have done had the Church at that time been pacifist.

To quote, as the Rev. Foley does, from a few Fathers who were obviously specifically pacifist in order to prove that the Church itself was so, is surely as misleading as if, in 500 years time, someone quoted from the sermons of Donald Soper and Canon Raven in order to prove that the Church in 1957 was unified in a pacifist policy.—ESME WYNNE-TYSON, Clarwyn, 9 Park Lane, Selsey, Sussex.

Labour Party and the H-bomb

THE overwhelming rejection by the Labour Party Conference of the resolution on the unilateral abandonment of the manufacture of H-bombs must surely convince pacifists once and for all that they cannot vote Labour and reject the use of the bomb at the same time.

The time has come for all pacifists and opponents of nuclear weapons to help build up an alternative to all the other parties. The Fellowship Party will not hesitate to speak and vote against the most dangerous and immoral illusion, that force will preserve peace.—R. S. TRAFFORD, Prospective Fellowship Party Candidate for Peterborough, 200 Eastfield Rd., Peterborough, Northants.

Israel and the Middle East

MR. FENNER BROCKWAY, MP, is to be congratulated on his appraisal of the Middle East situation in Peace News Sept. 20.

He rightly points to Arab hatred of Israel as the greatest danger. As is well known, Israel has over and over again held out the hand of peace to her neighbours

only to have it rudely dashed aside on each occasion.

The feudal monarchs and reactionary dictators who unfortunately hold sway in the area make no secret of their intention to destroy Israel by force as soon as they can. In the meantime they refuse to recognise her and harass her in which ever way they can.

Thus the only democratic, progressive and dynamic state in the Middle East is kept isolated and prevented from making what could undoubtedly be a great contribution to the development of the region.

If, as Mr. Brockway states, a more realistic approach to the Israel problem is emerging in Egypt, this is to be welcomed and encouraged. Everything must be done to settle outstanding differences in the Middle East, as elsewhere, around the conference table and not on the battlefield.—H. PINNER, 4, Kenyland Court, Hendon Way, London, N.W.4.

Israel's population increase

PEACE NEWS (Sept. 13) said that a nuclear war (the third world war) is "liable to erupt in the Middle East. That is the ultimate danger of the present situation." And the occupation of Palestine by the Zionists is at the bottom of the trouble. Will the sort of return that the Jews have made to the "Holy Land" involve the world in destruction? It is a sombre thought.

Referring to the activities of the Israelis in 1951, Ritchie Calder (in "Men Against the Desert") said that "Palestine has been described as the 'boiling pot' of the Middle East. It is not a boiling pot but a pressure cooker."

In 1948 there were 759,000 Jews in Palestine. In 1956 there were 1,650,000 (Norman Bentwich). The large natural increase of population of such hemmed-in nations as Israel always constitutes a menace, real or imagined, to its neighbours. But Israel is importing, beyond her natural increase, 100,000 more Jews every year.

The partially-artificially created bulge on her frontiers can scarcely be contained on her own side, whilst the increasing menace must promote increasing fear among the Arabs. Some of us believe that the pressure cooker is deliberately pressurised, and is meant to burst. Anyway, the Jerusalem Correspondent of The Times said in July that the plan of the 100,000 annual immigration of the Jews was "formulated to serve defensive strategy." Is it not time that Peace News published factual studies of the threat of war in the Middle East?—FRANK HANCOCK, "Gabriels," Charmouth, Dorset.

Police and the Editor

YOUR gallantry in "falling-in" with two comrades of the male sex in the Ban the H-bomb march recently, in order to stand between three anxious looking members of the "weaker" sex, reminds me of the old and probably apocryphal story of the conscientious objector who was a book-maker. When asked at his Tribunal what he would do if he saw his mother being attacked by a German, he replied: "I'd lay two-to-one on the old woman."

I commend this story, sir, to your attention.—SYBIL MORRISON, 6 Apollo Place, London, S.W.10.

Fellowship Cards

This 1957 range is more colourful and attractive than ever

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The Carol Singers
Attractive single card for children in two colours. 2½d. each | 5. Star over Bethlehem
Most attractive multi-coloured card—scene of Bethlehem by night. 6d. each |
| 2. The Dove
Lovely double card with words by Laurence Housman. 3d. each | 6. Church and Christmas Tree
Beautiful card in multi-coloured. Words by A. Dorothy Angus. 6d. each |
| 3. Shepherds in the Field
Double card in two colours. "His name shall be the Prince of Peace." 4d. each | 7. International Card
Design as 6. Greeting in English, French, German, Russian, Latin and Welsh. 6d. each |
| 4. Welsh Card
Design as 3. Words in Welsh by Gwilym Tilly. 4d. each | |

(All cards supplied with envelopes)

ORDER YOUR SAMPLE SET WITHOUT DELAY. 2s. 9d. POST FREE

(The sample set does not include No. 4)

All obtainable from:
THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION, 29 GT. JAMES ST., LONDON, W.C.1

CAL

UNTIL the carried all those automat the dea Act of

In 1951 ernment. This mov of publi rise in th

No that th the wo the mu to dec the re rested eviden shown appra Since executed.

Now the fo circum The N fortunate and abo official National its supp of retent

As a penalty. Under t ernment would st matter. voting ir tion at liamenta year.

Since that the cost the abolition of keen provinci main tas

This i by a lac are volu it is bu ment m the refer is no of a lack c Zealand less."

A and a is the adopt in a Speak have ad have be have a closer t

The l to allow A numl to prod Govern doubtfu case wh will at of peo ignoran referenc

What in news country cost of all the a large 2,000,000 Predi in such dums a in the favoura

The any coi

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT REFERENDUM FOR NEW ZEALAND

UNTIL 1935 when the Labour Party came to power the death penalty existed in New Zealand and was carried out from time to time. From 1935 to 1941 all those convicted of murder received automatic reprieve, and then in 1941 the death penalty was abolished by Act of Parliament.

In 1950, however, a National Party Government reintroduced the death penalty. This move was encouraged by a great deal of public emotionalism and by a steady rise in the murder rate from 1940 to 1945.

No cognizance was taken of the fact that this was a common trend throughout the world, nor of the fact that since 1945 the murder rate had just as steadily begun to decline. The Government's case for the reintroduction of the death penalty rested almost entirely upon anecdotal evidence, some of which has since been shown to be grossly misleading and approaching dishonesty.

Since 1950 eight persons have been executed.

Now in 1957 the question has come to the fore once again. To-day, however, circumstances have changed.

The New Zealand Labour Party has unfortunately lost much of its former vigour and abolition has ceased to be part of its official platform. On the other hand, the National Government realise that many of its supporters no longer favour a policy of retention.

Steady education

As a result, the question of the death penalty has become a non-party issue. Under these circumstances any wise government would set up a commission which would study the evidence of experts on the matter. Instead, New Zealanders will be voting in a referendum to decide the question at the same time as the general parliamentary elections in November of this year.

Since both political parties have decided that the issue is too hot to handle and may cost them too many votes, the cause of abolition has been taken up by small groups of keen reformers in the various cities and provincial towns of the country. Their main task is the education of the voters.

This is a task hampered in many ways: by a lack of efficient organisation since all are voluntary workers; a lack of time, for it is but a few months since the Government made clear their intention to hold the referendum; a lack of finance, for there is no official backing from any quarter; and a lack of interest that is typical of the New Zealander's attitude of "I couldn't care less."

A presentation of the relevant facts and a steady education wherever possible is the most efficient line that can be adopted. This policy has been pursued in a number of directions.

Speakers panels have been set up and have addressed numerous groups. Articles have been offered to newspapers, and most have accepted material for publication closer to the time of the referendum.

Use of finance

The broadcasting authorities have agreed to allow four short talks on a national link. A number of Church bodies are intending to produce leaflets for their members. The Government itself is issuing a leaflet of doubtful value presenting both sides of the case which will go to all voters. This last will at least raise the question in the minds of people and also inform many still ignorant of the fact that there is to be a referendum.

What finance is available is to be used in newspaper advertisements throughout the country just prior to the referendum. The cost of two quarter page advertisements in all the major newspapers will be £1,400—a large sum to raise in a country of 2,000,000 people.

Predictions of results are always difficult in such matters, but knowing that referendums almost never achieve social changes in the direction of reform, hopes for a favourable outcome are by no means high.

The case for abolition is a strong one in any country to-day, but when faced with a

referendum and the necessity of educating an apathetic public the task is a formidable one. Our hope is that many who have thought little about the subject will ignore their rights and choose not to vote.

It would, of course, be a salutary rebuke to the Government if a substantial number of informed votes were cast, for the fact is

By The Rev.

K. R. McCrostie

that they are shirking their duty as the elected representatives of the nation.

No government to-day need abolish capital punishment with fear and trepidation of the consequences. They have the experience of so many other nations to go upon. In addition, the New Zealand Government has the factual knowledge of what happened in their own country during a fifteen year period without capital punishment.

In the years 1936 to 1950 inclusive which were without the death penalty there were

150 murders known to the police; in the previous fifteen years there were 154. There was certainly no increase, and if allowance is made for the population increase during those years the murder rate fell from 105.5 per million of population (1921-1935) to 87.6 (1936-1950), or from an average annual rate of 7 per million of population to an average annual rate of 5.8.

Facts such as these and the many other arguments that so strongly support abolition count for little in a referendum where the vast majority of voters will decide the issue in their hearts and not their heads. A substantial minority vote will no doubt mean that New Zealand will at least follow the lead given by England and restrict the death penalty to a few categories of homicide only.

If, however, in spite of all that can be done, the vote for abolition is but a small one, it will be a brave government indeed that will dare to raise the subject for many a year to come.

ON BEING A PROHIBITED IMMIGRANT

Police on my trail in Uganda

By GEORGE HOUSER

Last week, the Rev. George Houser, Executive Secretary of the American Committee on Africa, which seeks to inform American people on African issues, told how he was banned from British East and Central African territories.

In this concluding article, Mr. Houser relates events from the point where, reaching Kampala, Uganda, Immigration Officers agreed to allow him to stay.

DURING the five days in Kampala, the officials seemed to keep a careful eye on me. Not only was at least one Immigration Officer in evidence quite frequently at the hotel, but police from the Special Branch CID were assigned to me.

It was quite obvious that I was being followed, and in order to make the situation perfectly plain and also to make everyone concerned feel easy, I was determined to speak to the police and other officials and offer to let them know where I was going.

In spite of the self-consciousness which is produced as a result of being followed and the uneasiness felt by those whom I was visiting, I must say that the police were courteous and friendly.

SEEN OFF AT THE AIRPORT

On Saturday afternoon a CID man was waiting in the lobby of my hotel as Africans came asking for me and other persons telephoned me. On Sunday I was taken for a ride to see the town. Two policemen followed.

After a while I got out of the car and waited for them. I approached them, and said it would be a lot easier for all if they knew where I was going. Then they wouldn't get lost.

They were making my African friends nervous, I told them. "They don't need to be nervous," one replied. "I understand you need to get to Entebbe tomorrow. I happen to be going there and could give you a ride."

He had to follow me, and I had to get to Entebbe, so I replied, "If you're sure I am not going to take you out of your way!"

I RIDE WITH POLICE

Within the limits of the situation, I enjoyed the contact with the police. For the last seven hours I was in Uganda the Special Branch policeman practically served as my chauffeur. He had to follow me, and I had no transportation. Therefore, he took me where I was going. This included visits to two government offices, a trip around Entebbe, lunch, and the ride to the airport.

At one of the government offices, an Administrative Officer in Entebbe told me he understood my problem, but refused to say why I was not allowed to remain.

"No government divulges that kind of information," he said.

I spent two hours with the American Consul in Kampala discussing the facts of the case.

I was well seen off at the airport. Both the immigration authorities and the police were there, acting under separate instructions. A note from the Tanganyika Government was given me at the airport. The note, under the signature of the Principal Immigration Officer of Uganda, read:

"I am directed to inform you that the decision of the Principal Immigration Officer, Dar-es-Salaam, declaring you a Prohibited Immigrant in Tanganyika in terms of Section 5 (1) (f) of the Immigration (Control) Ordinance, was on 19.7.57 confirmed by the Governor in Council of Tanganyika. I have accordingly to inform you that you will not be admitted to Tanganyika Territory."

It was obvious that the three British East African territories of Uganda, Kenya and Tanganyika were acting in concert in my case.

I MUST CONJECTURE . . .

In all my discussions with officials in Uganda, no one would or could give me any reason for my "prohibited" status. This, of course, is government policy. I am most anxious to find out what the problem is. Short of having any explanation, I naturally must conjecture.

I do not believe that the prohibition is necessarily against the American Committee on Africa, for apparently my prohibition antedates the organisation of the Committee. Without having any data to guide me, I am left to assume that I cannot gain entrance to those sections of British Africa which often are referred to as "multi-racial."

I doubt if there can be any misinformation in the files of the governments of East and Central Africa about possible Communist sympathies because my politics have always been quite antithetical to Communism.

The answer may lie in my inter-racial activities in the United States, and in my outspoken opposition to the pattern of race relations in South Africa and sympathy for organised efforts which oppose the government's apartheid programme there.

And yet if this is the basis for the action against me, it is a contradiction since all of the governments involved in my case officially point toward a policy of "partnership" and "multi-racialism."

Mixed Schools for Central Africa

FROM PAGE ONE

time before this happens, but I think it is going to happen in the next two or three years."

Mr. W. L. Rendall, one of the angry members of the Legislative Council, said this week that any suggestion for immediate racial integration at schools in the Territory was "precipitant and untimely". Questioning the implications of Sir Arthur's speech, Mr. Rendall said:

"Is this a definite statement of policy agreed to by the Federal Parliament whose responsibility it is for European education?"

"If not, should a Territorial Governor make such a statement on such a controversial matter as race relations which are likely to increase the fears of Europeans?"

Precipitant and untimely

Mr. Rendall said that when Mr. James Callaghan, MP, was in Northern Rhodesia recently he said that as long as settlers saw fit to refuse—even at a civic luncheon—any African representing an official or unofficial body, so long would he and his colleagues in England refuse Dominion status.

"Although Socialist threats need not be taken too much to heart, the fact is that if the Governor's speech implies a lack of interest on the part both of adult and juvenile Europeans to the African and that immediate integration of the races at schools in Central Africa was the only answer, it is essential to state that this is both precipitant and untimely."

"If the Governor's 'cheek by jowl' speech implied that within two or three years Secondary School pupils will sit down together," said Mr. Rendall indignantly, "this was not only misleading but a usurpation of the Federal Parliament's responsibility in European education."

European Economic Co-operation No. 4

What is the Common Market?

The Common Market membership: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands.

THE Common Market and Euratom were first proposed at a meeting of the six ECSC foreign ministers at Messina in June, 1955. The broad plan of the Common Market is that all tariffs and quantitative restrictions on trade (of any kind) between the six countries should be gradually abolished, and that they should adopt a common tariff against non-member countries, during the next 12-15 years. There are proposals for dealing with monopoly and discriminatory trade practices, for facilitating the mobility of labour and capital between the six countries, and for reducing the dislocations of their present economic systems which might be caused by the tariff changes.

It is to be supervised by an executive permanent European Commission, a Council of Ministers, and an Assembly. The Commission's powers will be considerably less than those of the High Authority of ECSC, since the Ministers will have the final power of decision, although they can only act on "proposals" made by the Commission. Next week: The Free Trade Area.

These notes on European Economic Co-operation are taken from No. 2 of Documents on World Affairs (United World Education and Research Trust, 29 Great James St., London, W.C.1 6A.)

MORALS AND WAR

"WAR and Peace" is a symposium composed of quotations mainly from Catholic sources, including the Vatican, in which the issues raised in the moral problem of modern war are discussed. It has been reprinted from an American magazine by the Pax Society, 37 Northiam, Woodside Park, London, N.12, from whom it can be obtained at 9d. a copy.

Atoms for Peace Conference opens

The International Atomic Energy Agency conference has opened in Vienna. A report from our correspondent there will appear in Peace News next week.

'TELL THE YANKS TO GO HOME'

I HAVE never had doubts as to what Britain's policy should be in regard to the A- and H-bomb: as a nation we should never have made it: we must now renounce it. I am glad that at last the Parliamentary Labour Party seems to be coming to this conclusion. But may I please disagree with Mr. Zilliacus and Mrs. Castle. You quote them as saying that if Britain opts out of the nuclear-power-club (as we are agreed she should) we must "close our airfields to America" and "tell the Yanks to go home." Mr. Mikardo adds, "We cannot renounce the bomb and let it be used from our shores."

I am convinced that such a corollary does not necessarily follow from a British renunciation, and I, personally, hold that it would be a mistake if we assumed that it should. May I give two reasons?

As citizens of a civilised nation, I and my family have renounced the unilateral use of force. I neither have the power to protect my home nor do I claim the right to do so. But it does not follow from this that I must refuse to allow the police to enter my property in order to protect it if they should require to do so. It seems, therefore, that so long as Russia is armed with A- and H-weapons it is not necessarily morally or politically wrong for Britain to allow America the bases from which she may seek to protect our nation—provided both Britain and America are agreed that these bases should be made available.

Nuclear giants

It seems to me that, in a world which presently has no effectively enforceable world law and no world police force, it is reasonable that so long as Russia keeps the force with which she could dominate the globe, America had better retain sufficient force to prevent that happening. By the same token, so long as America has her immense army Russia is prudent to retain her sovereign power to check the possibility of American world dominion. Only when a world Government has been agreed upon and has been created will these two nuclear giants be able safely to disarm and place themselves under the protection of world law. Even so, in this absurd ungoverned world we now inhabit, there is no need for a multiplicity of self-appointed world-policeman-powers. Two are quite sufficient. But while there is one the second is essential!

★

IF what Britain did affected only Britain I'd agree with Konni Zilliacus and Barbara Castle; I would not object to "sending the Yanks home." But what we do here does not affect only us. It will be done deliberately (I hope) to set an example. We intend to encourage France and Germany to do likewise. Of course we do. But if Germany and France and the others were to follow Mrs. Castle's advice and "send the Yanks home," is Mrs. Castle quite certain that some future Russian Government might not think it expe-

dient to invade Europe in order to conquer an incipient Nazism in Germany before a second Hitler arose? And would she approve of this? And if she did not, would she want the Americans to return to liberate a Europe from which she had given them their notice to quit?

In a world of sovereign states surely you must take care of the power which a nation possesses; you cannot rely on the goodwill or good sense of its *existing* government. If West Germany, and the other European nations, following Britain's lead, renounce the A- and H-weapons (as I hope they will) and send the Yanks home (as I hope they won't), are we prepared to leave it to Russia in future years to "take care of Germany"? This is an important question. It seems to me fair to assume the possibility (I put it no higher) that Federal Germany, which now possesses no nuclear armoury, might one day change its government and decide to equip itself with these frightful weapons. Ostensibly it might do this to protect itself from the possibility of an attack from East Germany; but from the viewpoints of Moscow and elsewhere such a manoeuvre might look suspiciously like a preparation for the integration of Germany and the occupation of her "lost provinces" by force.

Who dares completely to rule out the possibility of a revival of German Nazism? Order America to quit Europe and you may be producing the only circumstances which could breed this event. A fear of Russian Communism in the West-German mind is perhaps the only phobia upon which neo-Nazis could ride to power. It is the realisation, surely, of this danger which has played its part in Dr. Adenauer's recent electoral success.

Hitler's way

The Germans want to be associated with the West; they want to be part of NATO; surprisingly, they want to keep the Americans on their territory—for the alternative which Mrs. Castle would have them adopt, namely, of protecting themselves by their own moral courage is too terrifying for them to contemplate. As Hitler wrote in Mein Kampf: "The problem of rearming Germany is not how to produce arms, it is how to produce a spirit in the people which

makes them willing to bear arms; for when that spirit fills a people the will finds a thousand means each of which ends in a weapon." And remember that the breeding ground of Nazism was and is anti-Communism, which is fear.

★

FOR these, and many other reasons, I am convinced that if Britain renounces the bomb, as I believe we must, I sincerely hope we do not "tell the Yanks to go home."

For my own part I would have Britain as a nation immediately and unconditionally renounce the manufacture and use of the A- and H-weapons. But I would also have us admit that while Russia and America feel unable to trust one another simultaneously and together to disarm, a proper balance and distribution of their respective forces around the globe is desirable. Britain, I maintain, can and should immediately and unilaterally renounce the bomb; but I do not believe that either Russia or America can or should do so unless the other does so simultaneously and under really effective enforceable world control. Moreover, this world control can only be produced by complete universal disarmament within a World Federal Government. Alas, this is not yet in sight.

Middle-world

Meanwhile, Britain with all the other non-nuclear nations of the middle-world should get together and create above themselves a supra-national authority which could enforce and maintain upon them their good (non-nuclear) resolutions. I would like to see this non-nuclear Federation of Nations incorporated into the UN in such a way that it could provide proper facilities (i.e., bases) both to America and to Russia to enable these two nuclear giants to balance and contain one another's power-potential until the time comes when they, too, both together, are prepared to join the Federation of Nations and to submit themselves to its enforceable disarmament conditions.

But if we in Britain merely renounce nuclear weapons and then, in our innocence, "tell the Yanks to go home," we shall be advocating a policy which the not-so-inno-

'No!' - says Henry Usborne

in this challenge to his three fellow MPs: Konni Zilliacus, Barbara Castle and Ian Mikardo

PEACE NEWS VIEWPOINT—PAGE FOUR

cent will happily carry to its disastrous conclusion. The best, I know, can sometimes be the enemy of the good; Mrs. Castle's policy is a far simpler one than mine to preach; but equally I am aware that what appears to the simple to suffice is sometimes what the devil would advocate.

IF THE GREENGROCER HAD A GUN TOO

The veteran Quaker Peace worker, Ruth Fry, has issued a new pamphlet, "Let Us Abolish War" (2d. from 48, Clarendon Road, London, W.11), from which the following extract comes.

PERHAPS when there is a general realisation that victorious wars are a disaster for the conqueror, we may begin to change our minds. We shall see that *ideas* cannot be defended by wars, and that we should truly be safer without the delusion of defence. And perhaps we have reached the moment envisaged by Churchill in the House of Commons in November, 1953, when he said: "When everybody is able to kill everybody else, nobody will want to kill anyone at all."

If it seems to you alarming to live in an unarmed world, just put to yourself this picture. Suppose you were to wake up to find yourself in a world where everyone went fully armed. You would find that your greengrocer, when you complained of the staleness of his goods, might be annoyed at your criticism, and shoot you in the back as you left his shop. Of course, everyone would teach their children to aim well, and you would give them the best weapons you could afford—perhaps some neat little bombs that they could throw easily at any time that they were frightened. How ever many guns you kept in your house, would you feel safe?

We see the absurdity of that picture, but is it any more absurd than the world of to-day?

I think we may rightly transfer the argument to international affairs. If we awoke to find ourselves in a world which had abolished all military forces, but where a world Federalist Government had been established with an International unarmed Force like the London Police Force I think we should feel far safer. And the way to that is by showing our genuine friendship and goodwill to all other nations, and, as I have said, by the use of money saved by disarmament for the good of our neighbours, so that our existence is no threat, but a definite asset to other nations. For friendship and fellowship are far greater protection than tanks and bombers.

* * *

I do not believe that the people of one country really wish to wage war against those of another. Without propaganda of hate, urging them on, there can be very few (other than the armament manufacturers, who naturally stand to gain) who really wish to go into the devilish business of mass murder. But we must cease to exalt our States into Gods—we must realise that we are all citizens of the world, the children of God, and organise a federation of the world. For now the world is so small—when it can be circled in a matter of hours—it is absurd to have rival States. We have truly the choice between living as friends, with the safety of friendship, or dying as enemies.

Taxes for war: Appeal filed in USA

CAN the Government take money from the man of conscience to do things that he will not do himself?

This question was raised by an American writer, Milton Mayer, last December in his tax suit against the United States Government. U.S. District Judge Goodman refused to consider it in March when he gave judgment against Mayer, expressing amazement that a citizen should come into court claiming a right not to pay legally levied taxes.

Milton Mayer wants to pay his taxes. He asks only that they should not be used for war or preparation for war. He does not feel in conscience that he can allow the Government to conscript his money to buy guns, build bigger bombs, and pay others to use them.

He further contends that the Government's refusal to use his taxes for non-war purposes is in conflict with the First Amendment guaranteeing freedom of worship.

Because they think the principle involved in Milton's case is important to all who believe that individual conscience ought to be free, and that this principle should be adjudicated, two well-known American defenders of CO rights, Henry H. Crane and Harrop A. Freeman are calling for sup-

port for an appeal. Francis Heisler, Attorney for Milton Mayer, is filing the appeal brief in the U.S. Court of Appeals in San Francisco.

The courts have held that a man jeopardised his CO status by working, prior to his conscription, in a factory or farm which sold some of its products to the armed forces. Francis Heisler argues that the courts must either reverse these decisions or uphold Mayer's contention that he jeopardises his CO status by paying taxes to help support the armed forces.

The Government seems to take this case seriously; the U.S. Attorney-General has notified the Court of Appeals that his office will represent the Government directly, superseding the local U.S. Attorney.

An additional \$1,500 is needed to cover the court costs alone, and an appeal has been launched in the USA.

American readers may send donations to the "Mayer Tax Fund," The Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors, 2006 Walnut Street, Philadelphia 3, Pa.

PPU RELIGION COMMISSION

Pacifist Universalist Service
3.30 p.m. Sunday, October 13
Friends' International Centre
32 Tavistock Square, Euston
Discourse by Donald Groom
"BHOODAN"

PRINTING

MAGAZINES • PAMPHLETS
NEWSLETTERS • POSTERS
Reports, Balance Sheets, and
all Commercial Printing

Enquiries receive prompt attention.

C. A. BROCK & Co.
LIMITED

79 Southern Row, London, W.10

DIARY

As this is a free service we reserve the right to select for publication notices sent in. We nevertheless desire to make it as complete a service as we reasonably can, and therefore urge organisers of events to:

1. Send notices to arrive not later than Mon. a.m.
2. Include: Date, TOWN, Time, Place (hall, street); nature of event; speakers, organisers (and secretary's address).

Saturday, October 12
LONDON: 3 p.m.; 29 Gt. James St., W.C.1. Pax Annual General Meeting (Twenty-first anniversary). Speaker: Dr. Cecil Gill, "Pax in Perspective." Non-members welcome.

Sunday, October 13
LONDON: 3.30 p.m.; Friends International Centre, 32 Tavistock Sq., Euston, London, W.C.1. Pacifist Universalist Service. Discourse by Donald Groom, "Bhoodan."

BRISTOL: 8 p.m.; "Walk to Freedom." Film of the Bus Boycott by the Negroes of Montgomery, Alabama. Redfield Youth Centre.

Monday, October 14
BIRMINGHAM: 8 p.m.; 221 Vicarage Road, Kings Heath. Speaker: Charles Christmas, JP, "World Peace Congress at Colombo." Kings Heath and Cotteridge PPU Group. All welcome.

LONDON APPELATE TRIBUNAL for CO's. Ebury Bridge Ho., Ebury Bridge Rd., Victoria, London, S.W.1. Morning 10.30 a.m.; Afternoon 2.15 p.m. Public admitted.

OLTON: 7.45 p.m.; 38 Westbourne Rd. Meeting and discussion. All welcome. PPU.
WOLVERHAMPTON: 7.30 p.m.; Public Library (Study Room). Snow Hill. Youth Forum on "Christian Youth Looks at the World." Speakers: John Ray (Pakistan); Jan Oldekamp (Holland); Ling Sing Wong (Malaya); Fred Moorhouse (Gt. Britain). Chairman: Miss K. E. Bower, MA. For. Secretary: R. W. Glynn Jones, 4 Richmond Rd., Sedgley, Dudley, Worcs.

Tuesday, October 15
LIVERPOOL: 8 p.m.; Friends Mtg. Ho., Hunter St. "Any Questions." Panel: Fred Moorhouse, Jan Oldekamp, Barbara Whitehead. For.

UPMINSTER: 8 p.m.; St. Mary's Lane School (nr. The Bell). Speaker: Dennis Hunt, "Russia and the UN" (first-hand account). Hornchurch Way to Peace Group, 52 Fleet Ave., Uppminster.

Wednesday, October 16
EDMONTON: 8 p.m.; In the Church Parlour, Independent Church, Knights Lane (Church building in front now demolished). Speaker: Hugh Brock, "Story of Peace News." Edmonton PPU Group.

CLAPHAM: 8 p.m.; Labour Party HQ, 27 Clapham Park Rd. (5 mins. from Clapham Common Tube Station). Myrtle Solomon, London Area Organiser, and further discussion of pamphlet "Unarmed." Clapham and Dist. PPU.

Thursday, October 17
ALTON: 7.30 p.m.; 32 Tower St. "Non-violence in the Bible," by John D. White. Alton PPU.
SOUTHAMPTON: 7.30 p.m.; Marlards Hall, opp. Civic Centre. Film Show, "Shadow of Hiroshima," "Same Old Story," etc. "Peace News" on sale. Anti-H-bomb petitions. Southampton Council for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapon Tests.

Friday, October 18
LOCAL TRIBUNAL FOR CO's. Fulham Town Hall (opposite Fulham Broadway Underground Station). Morning 10.30 a.m.; Afternoon 1.15 p.m. Public admitted.

Saturday/Sunday, October 19/20
SOUTHEAST: 3 p.m.; 10 p.m.; Friends Mtg. Ho., Dundonald Drive, Leigh-on-Sea. Speakers: Minnie Pallister, Stewart Morris and Ian Dixon. PPU.

Monday, October 21
GRAVESEND: 8 p.m.; 116 Darnley Road. Discussion, "Breaking through Barriers." Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Saturday, October 26
HULL: 3 p.m.; at 6 Bond St. Twenty-first Anniversary of the First Peace Centre in Hull. Light Refreshments and talk of yesterday and tomorrow. Early pioneers specially invited. PPU.

IPSWICH: 3 p.m.; For Rededication Service (Leader: Rev. A. G. Errey). 4 p.m. Tea. 5 p.m. PPU Annual General Mtg. Friends Mtg. Ho., Fonneau Rd., Ipswich.

SOUTHEAST-ON-SEA: 7.30 p.m.; Avenue Baptist Church, United Nations Film Show. All welcome. Southend Peace Council.

EPSOM: 7.30 p.m.; Methodist Hall (opposite Police Station), Ashley Road. Films of International Voluntary Service for Peace: (1) Documentary by London University Film Society, "Working Agreement"; (2) "Who is My Neighbour?" John Loveday, AFC, and C. D. Legon, BA, on "A Tide in the Affairs of Men." Film: "Shadow of Hiroshima." Epsom and District Peace Fellowship. Ailsa Duncan, 55 Culverhay, Ashted, Surrey.

Sunday, October 27
LEEDS: 3 p.m.; Carlton Hill Mtg. Ho., Woodhouse Lane. Quarterly Area Meeting. PPU Yorkshire Area. Area Secretary: Mrs. C. M. Bulmer, 21 Westfield Cottages, Gildersome, Leeds.

Friday, November 1
GRAVESEND: 8 p.m.; St. George's Chapel of Unity, "Children of Hiroshima." With Rev. Lewis MacLachlan and Rev. Basil Huett. For.

Every week!

SATURDAYS
LIVERPOOL: 8 p.m.; Pier Head. Open-air meeting of Liverpool and District Peace Board

SATURDAYS AND SUNDAYS
LONDON: Weekend Workcamps, cleaning and redecorating the homes of old-age pensioners. IVSP, 72 Oakley Sq., London, N.W.1.

MONDAYS
SHIPLEY: 7.30 p.m.; PPU, Labour Party Rooms, Westgate, Shipley.

TUESDAYS
MANCHESTER: 1-2 p.m.; Deansgate Blitz Site. Christian pacifist open-air mtg. Local Methodist ministers and others. MPF.

WEDNESDAYS
KIDDERBROOKE: 8 p.m.; 141 Woolacombe Rd. Talks, plays, discussion, music, radio, etc. Fellowship Party.

THURSDAYS
LEYTONSTONE: 8 p.m.; Friends Mtg. Ho., Bush Road, E.10 and E.11 Group. PPU.
LONDON, W.C.1: 1.20-1.40 p.m.; Church of St. George the Martyr, Queen St., Southampton Row. Weekly lunch-hour Service of Intercession for World Peace. Conducted by Clergy and laymen of different denominations.

FRIDAYS
BIRMINGHAM: 5 p.m. onwards; Bull Street Meeting House (outside) Peace News Club.

When East meets West

By W. GRIGOR McCLELLAND

The reviewer was a member of the first Quaker Mission to Moscow and the Quaker Mission to China. He has lectured in America for the American Friends Service Committee.

The Interplay of East and West, by Barbara Ward. Allen and Unwin, 10s. 6d.

THE term "East" is now often used to refer to the Communist world. Here it means the ex-colonial world. It is good to have the present relationship between this East and the West set against a broad historical background.

In the first of the three Beatty Lectures delivered at McGill University, Montreal, in autumn 1955, Barbara Ward gives full emphasis to the disruptive impact of the post-Renaissance West upon Asia by contrasting it with the more stable relations that had developed in earlier times. She shows clearly how the Asians learnt aggressive nationalism from us.

The second lecture looks at the "revolution of expectation" for higher living standards in Asia, in the light of the rivalry between Western democracy and Soviet Communism. Miss Ward argues strongly for liberal economic aid from the West to the "free" Asian nations, on grounds of Western self-interest. She adds the moral argument: as we have shared wealth within the State, so now we are called to share it across frontiers; we must act like the good Samaritan whatever the colour of the man in the ditch. If we "recognise our moral responsibility to Asia," she adds, it will mean victory in the competition between Communist methods and those of the free mixed society. A happy harmony; the question of aid to China does not seem to occur to her.

There are certainly errors of emphasis in this lecture. Knowledge of the amount of pre-1917 industry in Russia, or of the amount of Western aid under the first five-year plan, would not materially alter the picture Asians rightly have of a country that has pulled itself up by its own bootstraps. The emphasis on heavy industry was not only due to the political prejudices she cites but also to fear of aggression leading to an insistence on speed. And in my view she under-estimates the skill with which the present Chinese leadership is handling its agricultural problems. China has already avoided many of the difficulties the Soviet Union had in its first eight years, and it is not true that there is "little new land that can be brought under cultivation."

In the third and final lecture Miss Ward discusses the prospects of overcoming the dominant force in this century, unbridled nationalism, asking whether "mankind has any vision that transcends frontiers." She emphasises the basic unity amongst the various religious views of man's nature and purposes and looks to a fruitful interchange between East and West on this level which may help the East to withstand the modern rationalist attack on religion which has swept so far over the West, and may help to reinvigorate the West with the wisdom of the East.

Miss Ward is stimulating and refreshing. She can hold her own with the experts over an astonishingly wide range of philosophical, political and economic matters. She

is definitely on the side of the angels, and free of much of the cant, the bigotry and the national pride that pervades so much public discussion. Yet a nagging doubt remains. The wonderful lines of policy she proposes—have they the slightest chance of whole-hearted implementation whilst present defence efforts, which she approves, are maintained? This brutal question is not even considered in this book. These defence efforts are hardly mentioned. The result is an inescapable air of unreality.

Criticism in Russia

Russian Youth Awakes: An Eyewitness report by Maurice Pelter (Newsletter Pamphlet, 2d.).

MAURICE PELTER was, for ten years, a Communist Party member: he resigned because of the party leaders' attitude to events in Hungary. This year he went to the World Youth Festival in Moscow, and found that his status of "ex-party member" induced young Russian Communists to discuss with unusual frankness their opinions of the present state of the country and its regime.

His comments seem to be shrewd and objective. His main conclusions are that the mass of the population, party and non-party, support the social system of their country, although with varying degrees of enthusiasm and criticism; that young intellectuals are finding their feet and probing with keen minds below the surface of the official fairy tales; but that the industrial worker is far less articulate and politically minded—"the facts of life" are beginning to force him to make new economic demands, but he finds himself without the machinery of struggle and has first the task of building one.

Blasphemy Laws

CONNOISSEURS of the curious will be interested to know that there exists a Society for the Abolition of the Blasphemy Laws. Its purpose is to secure the repeal of legislation contained in five Acts of Parliament, the earliest enacted in 1547 and the latest in 1819.

They seem to have been enforced, in modern times at least, with moderation. Indeed, it is doubtful whether there has ever been a prosecution under the most comprehensive of them, the Blasphemy Act, 1697, and the last recorded proceedings under any of them were in 1921, when a man was sentenced to nine months' imprisonment for selling in the street a blasphemous publication—an action by which a breach of the peace might have been caused.

Private Members Bills have several times been introduced into Parliament to remove these restrictions upon our liberty, but have never reached the Statute Book.

All this is gleaned from a new pamphlet "Abolish the Blasphemy Laws," 6d. net, by Robert S. W. Pollard, well known to many readers as a pacifist lawyer and vigorous campaigner for marriage law reform.

EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

Oregon signs to stop tests

WHEN a local cinema in Portland, Oregon, in the Far West of the USA showed a documentary life history of Albert Schweitzer, local pacifists handed copies of Schweitzer's declaration on the subject of H-bomb tests to cinema-goers and invited them to sign a petition to President Eisenhower, urging support of Albert Schweitzer's position.

"Three or four volunteers were on hand each night to distribute the statements and the petitions," Wil Hartzler, of the American Quakers' Regional Office in Portland, reports. He adds that over six hundred signatures were obtained during the first two weeks of the film's run.

Quite a number of people asked for copies of the petition to show to their friends.

"This initial effort is giving rise to the formation of the Oregon Committee to Halt Nuclear Tests."

Preview in Bournemouth

AFTER the Bournemouth Echo had described the town's expenditure of £8,000 on Civil Defence as "eyewash, nonsense and waste of money," Peace News' reader, John B. Score, followed up with a timely letter on September 21 reminding readers that the people who are burying their heads in the sand are those who fail to realise the significance of the fact that "NATO can promise to stop only 7 per cent. of missiles or bombs aimed at this island."

"Heads in sand" and "7 per cent." have acquired added interest since his letter was written.

CLASSIFIED Advertisements

TERMS: Cash with order, 3d. per word, min. 2s. 6d. (Box No. 1s. extra). Please don't send stamps in payment, except for odd pence. Address for Box No. replies: Peace News, 3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4. LATEST TIME for copy: Monday morning. Whilst the policy of Peace News is not to restrict any concern or individual from advertising in these columns, it must be noted that we do not necessarily share the views nor the opinions of all our advertisers.

MEETINGS
 Indian Institute of World Culture; lecturer, 8.30 p.m., Friday, Oct. 11—Donald Groom, "My Travels with Vinoba Bhave, Oct. 18—Jan Koenig, "Africa, Past and Present." Robert Crosbie House, 62 Queens Gdns., Paddington, London, W.2.

ACCOMMODATION
 HOMELY ACCOMMODATION and jolly good food for visitors and permanent guests. CANONBURY 1340, Telke Shayler, 27 Hamilton Pk., N.5.

FOR SALE
 EXTENSION LADDERS, special discount, winter sales. A. Roberts, 12 Clare Rd., Cardiff.
 WHAT ARE YOUR commercial and personal stationery needs? HOUSMANS STATIONERY DEPT. can deal with them. Plain postcards, 2s. 10d. per 100; white envelopes 6 x 3 1/2 ins., 21s. per 1,000 box; manilla, 14s. 6d. per 1,000 box; white bank paper 10 x 8 ins., 9s. per 500 sheets; newsprint 10 x 5 1/2 ins., 19s. per 1,000, 2s. 3d. per 100; plain economy labels 4 1/2 x 3 1/2 ins., 14s. 6d. per 1,000, 1s. 8d. per 100. All post free. Harley Bond Writing Pads, etc., from 6d. each, postage extra. All profits to Peace News. Write or call HOUSMANS STATIONERY DEPT., 3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4.
 STATIONERY, Gifts, Toys, Ornamental figures, all suitable Christmas, Birthdays. Send p.c. for full list. Tullitt, 95 Woolacombe Lodge Rd., Birmingham 29.
 MARKET GARDEN, 4 1/2 acres. Cottage tastefully furnished. Mains water, own electricity batteries. Various sheds, greenhouses, complete range of equipment, piggery, land stocked with flowers, soft fruit. A thriving concern, nothing but compost past seven years. Price £5,750. Full details: L. W. Gibson, Gweal Park, Dreage, Cornwall.

LITERATURE
 QUAKERISM. Information and literature respecting the Faith and Practice of the Religious Society of Friends, free on application to Friends' Home Service Ctee., Friends' House, Euston Rd., London, N.W.1.
 THE WORLD'S greatest book on the human mind for beginners. "Scientology: Fundamentals of Thought," by L. Ron Hubbard. Send 5s. 4d. to Antony Phillips, 23 Lavender Rd., S.E.9.

PERSONAL
 WAR RESISTERS' International welcomes gifts of foreign stamps and undamaged air mail covers. Please send to WRI, 88 Park Ave., Enfield, Middlesex.
 WE CAN HELP YOU. Use these columns to advertise your services, sell your products and seek your needs. Write to the Advertisement Manager, Peace News, 3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4.

PROPERTY REPAIRS, Conversions, New Houses, Industrial Developments and building work of all types efficiently carried out by Parsons and Co., "Phone TUL. 3052 for immediate attention and free estimate. DRUG-LESS REMEDIES??? FLU? CONSTIPATION? NERVES? Only 10s. Health Center, Adelaide Road, Dublin.
 IF YOU SHOP at a Co-op please give this number when making your next purchase:
 L 3 3 6 9 4 3

Your dividend will then be gratefully received by the Secretary, PEACE NEWS, 3 BLACKSTOCK ROAD, LONDON, N.4.

WIDOW, sixties. Would like to correspond with pacifist. Box 754.

SITUATIONS AND WORK WANTED
 ACCOUNTANT, writes up traders' books, prepares and agrees accounts for Income Tax; audits, repayment claims and all Income Tax matters. Provincial work undertaken. Box No. 743.

Special postal offer to new readers

8 PEACE NEWS 2s. 6d.
 (US 13 weeks for \$1)

Please send PEACE NEWS for..... to the name and address below.

I enclose £.....
 NAME.....
 ADDRESS.....

PEACE NEWS
 3 Blackstock Rd., London, N.4

STANDARD RATES

Great Britain:
 Ten wks. 5s.; 20 wks. 10s.; One yr. 25s.
 Abroad (Sea Mail):
 Twelve wks. 5s. 6d.; 24 wks. 11s.; One yr. 23s.
 AIR MAIL SUBSCRIPTION RATES
 N. Africa and Middle East:
 Twelve wks. 7s.; 24 wks. 14s.; One yr. 30s.
 India, South, East and West Africa
 America and S.E. Asia:
 Twelve wks. 8s.; 24 wks. 16s.; One yr. 34s.
 Australia and Far East:
 Twelve wks. 9s.; 24 wks. 18s.; One yr. 38s.

AIR EXPRESS EDITION
 to US and all parts of America, from our US Sales Office, c/o American Friends Service Committee, 20 South Twelfth St., Philadelphia 7, Pa. \$5 year \$1 three months.

OR hand this to your newsagent

Please deliver PEACE NEWS to me weekly

To M.....
 (Newsagent's name)
 Name.....
 Address.....

UNARMED DEFENCE

Portsmouth Labour Party will try again

THE resolution on unarmed defence proposed by the Portsmouth South Constituency Labour Party was not discussed on the floor of the Labour Party conference last week. But the delegates interested in this resolution plan to continue and enlarge the campaign to get a Royal Commission to examine the possibilities of unarmed resistance as a possible defence policy.

Of the 443 resolutions on the agenda, those which were closely related were combined into "composite resolutions." After discussion on the emergency resolutions and the 30 composite resolutions there was little time for others.

That was the fate of the Portsmouth South resolution.

Mr. J. Miller, the Portsmouth South delegate, told me in Brighton that his constituency party will continue to try to get the Labour Party to support a serious examination of non-violent resistance as a possible defence policy.

His party had discussed the matter "in great detail." The Women's Section of the Portsmouth South Party is "very, very strong on this," he said.

It was discussion of the idea in the Women's Section which led the party as a whole to consider it.

The Portsmouth party expect to have speakers on the subject and to undertake further study of the idea during the coming year.

Had the resolution come to the floor, the delegate from Berwick and East Lothian Constituency Labour Party was ready to second the motion.

At least 12 other delegates were ready to speak on its behalf.

Mr. Miller regretted that there had been no consideration of the matter. "Despite this being a revolutionary conference," he told me, "the most revolutionary and far-reaching resolution put before them was pushed into the background among resolutions on general disarmament procedures."

He had "more than appreciated" the help given by Peace News on his party's resolution and by Peace News readers in Portsmouth.

This resolution, he continued, cuts across the pacifist and non-pacifist positions. "What we want to find out is if there is another way. If there is, then no matter who we are, we will all pursue it."

WHITEHALL FOOTNOTE: Sir Stephen was due to lecture military officers at the Royal United Services Institute shortly after Peace News went to press on Wednesday. A report will appear next week.

Minnie Pallister to address PPU Conference

MINNIE PALLISTER, Sybil Morrison and Stuart Morris will be the speakers at a Peace Pledge Union week-end residential conference in London on December 14 and 15.

Although primarily for Area and Group officers of the Union, all members are invited to attend. The charge is 25s., and booking forms may be obtained from 6, Endsleigh Street, London, W.C.1.

Conference theme is "What the PPU should be doing and how it should be doing it."

DJILAS

"gives one of the clearest and profoundest statements on the relation of means and ends that I have ever encountered," writes

A. J. MUSTE

in his review of
"The New Class"

appearing

IN PEACE NEWS NEXT WEEK

H-bomb debate

★ FROM PAGE ONE

vital decision this conference is going to take."

Although the resolution was lost by 5,836,000 votes to 781,000, it was obvious that the idea of unilateral action to break the nuclear weapons race has now permeated the minds of people in Britain deeply enough to become a powerful force within a major Party.

NOT DESPONDENT

Frank Allaun, MP, told me after the vote had been announced and the resolution defeated:

"I am not at all despondent. The views so clearly demonstrated to-day at the conference show that what was dismissed only 12 months ago as the agitation of a handful of pacifists has already become a demand of the rank and file."

"This will grow still more and shortly be the official view of British Labour. When you consider that this is the most revolutionary idea in politics, such support is magnificent."

Other observers were not so confident. What will happen to the organised Left Wing of the Party now that there has been "the passing of a great leader"—as someone said—remains to be seen.

One thing seems clear: people are now ready to talk about unilateral action to end the nuclear race.

Newcastle study course

SUBJECTS ranging from World Hunger to Atomic Energy and Christian Pacifism will be discussed at a six-weeks study course which opens in Newcastle at 7.30 p.m. on Wednesday Oct. 16, at the Trinity Presbyterian Church.

Details of the course, entitled "Christian into Action", and organised by the Fellowship of Reconciliation may be obtained from S. Hockey, "Westbank", Fellside Road, Whickham, Newcastle.

Exclusive in PEACE NEWS next week

THE BRIDGE OVER THE RIVER KWAI

Claude Houghton's serialisation of the screenplay written by Pierre Boulle

IFOR team on tour

From Fred Moorhouse

UNDER the joint sponsorship of the British and International Fellowships of Reconciliation an international team of young pacifists will be touring Britain from October 13 to 19.

Leading the group will be Fred Moorhouse, Assistant Secretary of the British FOR and an ex-Serviceman. From Belgium will be André van der Mensbrugghe, a theological student who served many months in jail as a CO, and was at one time sent to a lunatic asylum as part of the "treatment" meted out to him for his offensive desire not to kill.

Jan Oldekamp, of Holland, is a Mennonite, and has been active in the work camp movement. Gerhard Jaspers from Dortmund in Germany is the student son of a Lutheran church official, and spent several weeks of this summer in Eastern Germany.

The object of the tour is both to make known in Britain the work of pacifists on the Continent and the difficulties under which they make their witness, and to bring the challenge of Christian pacifism in an international context. A particular point is being made of visits to universities and theological colleges.

Included in the team's crowded itinerary are visits to London, Oxford, Birmingham, Wolverhampton, Manchester, Liverpool, Bangor, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Durham, Leeds, Sheffield and Cambridge. In a number of places they will be teamed with other overseas folk on "Any Questions" panels.

INCREASED BRITISH POSTAL RATES

THE increase in British postal rates which came into force on October 1 does not affect the postage on single copies of Peace News to subscribers in Great Britain. Postage on larger supplies is almost doubled, but we do not propose, at present, to increase the charge to sellers. Copies for free distribution must, however, be increased to 3s. a dozen, post free.

Overseas subscribers (excluding readers of the Air Express Edition) must be asked to meet a slightly increased subscription rate. Foreign postage increases from 1d. to 1½d. on single copies sent by sea mail. The revised overseas subscription rate is 5s. 6d. for twelve weeks, 11s. for twenty-four weeks and 23s. a year, for supply by sea mail.

By Sybil Morrison

'Naked to mine enemies'

If you carry this resolution (unilateral abolition of the H-bomb) . . . you will send a British Foreign Secretary naked into the conference chamber.

—Aneurin Bevan, October 3, 1957.

Had I but serv'd my God with half the zeal
I serv'd my King, he would not in mine age
Have left me naked to mine enemies . . .
Corruption wins not more than honesty
Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace . . .

—Cardinal Wolsey, Henry VIII. Act III, Scene 2. William Shakespeare.

THAT Mr. Bevan should have come down, unequivocally, on the side of "the great deterrent", seems to have dismayed and confused large numbers of Labour Party rank and file, who had, apparently, expected him to repudiate the H-bomb on behalf of a future Labour Government, and demand unilateral action from the present Government.

There has been a wild tendency lately to call everyone pacifist who wanted this done, but the fact is that this is not a pacifist demand at all.

Ever since the second World War pacifists have been accused of advocating, and even procuring a reduction in arms, thereby rendering this country weak when the crisis came. But, pacifists have not advocated, and do not now advocate, a reduction in arms, on the contrary, because they believe the war method to be essentially evil, they advocate total disarmament and nothing less.

For those who sincerely believe in the H-bomb as a means of deterring nations from the total catastrophe of a nuclear-weapon war, the demand to abandon "the deterrent" merely seems dangerous and irresponsible. The very sincerity of their

belief is the most formidable obstacle that the abolitionists have to face.

Mr. Bevan said that he had probably made "more speeches to more people condemning the hydrogen bomb" than anyone else at the Conference, and was as strongly against it as ever. Yet he implored the conference to retain this monstrous evil in order that no British Foreign Secretary should go to the councils of the world stripped of the weapon with which to make his nefarious bargains. He apparently saw nothing immoral in this.

The State demands that the nation should be armed; Mr. Bevan is the servant of the State, and he will not, therefore, however forthright his denunciation of the evil thing, discard that which the State believes to be a necessary part of a means to an end. He may find, as Cardinal Wolsey found so long ago, that to serve evil means, even in loyalty to the State, may be to imperil the immortal soul.

★

If this monstrous weapon is as evil as he says it is, then there is real tragedy in the fact that he feels impelled to almost boast that he gives only lip-service to his abhorrence, as though there was no matter of conscience or principle involved.

Obviously, so long as the Labour Party does not discard the method of war, he would be faced, if he renounced the H-bomb, with the dilemma of deciding which "conventional" weapons are to be retained for Britain's so-called "commitments".

Unless there is to be total disarmament other weapons must be employed; perhaps conscription must be continued and rocket ranges equipped with the latest devices for blowing human beings to pieces without necessarily contaminating them with radioactive "fall-out".

Only those who repudiate all these weapons, not because they fear for their own skins, but because they find them morally repugnant, are standing on solid ground.

There is no answer today but the pacifist answer; war is an evil thing; it has always been evil; inherent in it is everything that, as individuals we denounce: violence, cruelty, falsehood, murder.

Nothing in life remains static; nuclear force has been harnessed for war, and if it is discarded, no doubt bacteriological warfare will take its place; only the total renunciation of war can save the world.

If Mr. Bevan had been willing to serve good instead of bargaining with evil he might have been the greatest leader of all time. He could have gone to the Councils of the world, not stripped naked, but equipped with the word for which mankind has waited for too long.

He would have discarded, not only the H-bomb but all the murderous weapons of war, and carried in his right hand "gentle peace". This great moral lead has not been forthcoming, but there is still time.

WEEKEND SCHOOL

accommodation and breakfast

Speakers:

MINNIE PALLISTER, STUART MORRIS and IAN DIXON, SOCIAL

October 19-20

2.30 p.m. Saturday 2 p.m. Sunday

"Pacifism—Vision and Practice"

10s. to S. Billson, 33 Compton Road, London, N.1.

Published by Peace News Ltd., 3 Blackstock Road, London, N.4, and Printed by Fish & Cook Ltd., 135 Fonthill Road, N.4.

The

No. 1,112

ADMIRAL

Wh
vic

BRITISH
listen-
King-Ha
Deterren
the Roy
in White
prove to

The Ins
Charter fo
of naval :

Admiral
of the In
pressed th
lecturer :
Anthony
the form
audience.

Auchinlec
Comma
the Min
Sandys, t
against ni

7

Sir Step
did not s
He had, t
thinking
radically

He was
completed
Age," wh
Gollancz

Instead
conventio
sary, he
fresh loo
involved
difficulty
the thoug

Sir S
get to
armed
of Defe
armed
can w
after w
to live
in whic
a new

"You
win it, y
a civilisat
Unil
Then S
tive. "I
idea] . .
unilateral
use of
poses." .
as it mig
The U
agree. "I
wound u
American
"NATO
suggested
tion pled
military